

51.1.82.

M46

~
The Roman Catholic Church
and the Public Schools.

By EDWIN D. MEAD.

BOSTON: GEORGE H. ELLIS.

1890.

Price, 35 Cents.

The Constitution of the United States.

With Bibliographical and Historical Notes and Outlines for Study.

PREPARED BY EDWIN D. MEAD.

50 pages. Price, 25 cents; one hundred copies, \$15.00. Address Directors of Old South Studies, Old South Meeting House, or D. C. Heath & Co., Boston.

This manual is published by the directors of the Old South Studies in History and Politics, for the use of schools, clubs, classes, and individual students. The societies of young men and women that are now being organized everywhere in America for historical and political study can do nothing better to begin with than to make themselves thoroughly familiar with the Constitution and its history. It is with the needs of such societies in mind that the table of topics for study and the very full bibliographical notes in this manual have been prepared.

Outline Studies of Holland.

PREPARED BY EDWIN D. MEAD.

20 pages. Price, ten cents. Published for the National Bureau of Unity Clubs. Charles H. Kerr & Co., Chicago.


These outlines for the study of the history, literature, art and general life of Holland are prepared with a view to a course occupying fourteen sessions of any society or club making use of them. Although, in the order of subjects, there is a general reference to chronology, this is not so strict as to prevent the grouping together of related subjects in the most systematic, suggestive and dramatic manner possible. The bibliographical section is full, but it is hoped not so full as to be confusing to any. The writer has endeavored always to make it plain what books are the best for those whose opportunities for reading and study are limited.

"The Roman Catholic Church and the Public Schools."

MR. EDWIN D. MEAD's addresses on the Roman Catholic Church and the Public Schools have been put together in a little volume of a hundred pages, published by George H. Ellis, Boston. The collection includes the address given before the Woman Suffrage League in Boston during the controversy over Swinton's history, the address before the Massachusetts Schoolmasters' Club at the close of the Boston conflict, and the address before the National Educational Association at Nashville, last summer, in the debate with Bishop Keane. These addresses have already been published as separate pamphlets, and of the Nashville address nearly fifty thousand copies have been circulated. Their publication together at this time, when the struggle over the Bennett law in Wisconsin has drawn the attention of the country anew to the whole subject, is opportune. There is almost no phase of the subject which Mr. Mead does not touch in these addresses. What is chiefly worthy of remark is that, although he is the warmest defender of the public school system and the most outspoken critic of the parochial schools, he has treated the Roman Catholics with a careful justice which has won their confidence as has been done, perhaps, by no other of their critics. *The Catholic Review*, the ablest of the Catholic newspapers, wrote last summer: "What we desire to call attention to in these pamphlets is the remarkable fairness with which Mr. Mead treats Catholics and their views. The first fourteen pages of the first essay might have been written by a Catholic. It looks as if, for the first time in American history, Catholics were about to meet in the arena a foeman who knows their strong and weak points as well as his own."

Price, paper, 35 cents.

GEORGE H. ELLIS . . . 141 Franklin Street, Boston.



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2009 with funding from
Boston Library Consortium Member Libraries

THE ROMAN CATHOLIC CHURCH AND THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS.

By EDWIN D. MEAD.

BOSTON: GEORGE H. ELLIS.

1890.

COPYRIGHT, 1890, BY EDWIN D. MEAD.

LB
1569
.M433
1890

INTRODUCTION.

THE address upon "The Roman Catholic Church and the School Question," which has the first place in the following pages, was delivered in connection with the now somewhat famous text-book controversy in Boston in the autumn of 1888, and was published at that time in pamphlet form. The address upon the question, "Has the Parochial School Proper Place in America?" was given before the National Educational Association, at Nashville, in July last. The writer declined the invitations for its publication at the time, as it was his desire to expand and strengthen that portion of the address devoted to the subject of moral training in the public schools. The leisure for this revision has never come, and the address is given here almost untouched.

The point to be further emphasized, however, although much needs to be said upon it, is clearly indicated in the address, and it is a simple point. The advocates of parochial schools among us say most about the inferiority of the moral training imparted by the public school. A comparison of the intellectual methods would be much more quickly disastrous to the critics, and it could not proceed far at all on the favorite *a priori* grounds. But it is precisely in the moral field that the public school is strongest and that its defenders may most confidently welcome challenge. This is the point to emphasize today. This is the place for the most searching comparison and for the sharpest word. The public school is the great moralizer of the low and immoral precinct, the great missionary, the great promoter of order, decency, civility, truthfulness, public spirit, aspiration and whatever makes for righteousness. It cannot be shown that the parochial school is herein

superior, where the two stand side by side. It cannot be shown that the moral training imparted by the schools is superior in those countries where the Church has the exclusive control of education. The contrary of this is true. It is precisely as the trainer and the guardian of character, as the means to broader, manlier, nobler life, that the public school makes its strongest appeal to every earnest and unprejudiced American.

This moral function of the public school will be more highly estimated and more faithfully discharged, according as our definition of the State and of good citizenship grows high. The brief address upon "Patriotism in the Public Schools," delivered immediately after the contest in Boston a year ago and reflecting the spirit of that time, is here given place as containing a more express plea than the longer addresses for that larger public spirit and more religious politics which we need to cultivate today and which have a bearing so direct and potent upon the problems of our national education.

Boston, April, 1890.

The Roman Catholic Church and the School Question

WHEN the foolish are hot, it is time for the wise to be cool. Eternal vigilance is the price of liberty, but a habit of viewing each midsummer explosion as the crack of doom is not the best qualification for the vigilance committee in the time of real danger. I trust I shall never be accused of political indifferentism; but sometimes in these heated weeks I count it expedient to say to some of my good friends, Republican friends and Democratic friends, that the present election seems to me the least important presidential election in our history, and that I think it makes very little difference whether Mr. Cleveland or Mr. Harrison be elected. There is no question in the country more important than the school question. There is no institution in the country, to my thinking, so important as the public school, none whose interests we should guard so vigilantly or so jealously. There is nothing in the country of which I am more jealous than the multiplication of Roman Catholic parochial schools. They will never give anything but a parochial education, never a catholic and broad, education, and the system is bad. I am jealous of the constant unfair and captious fault-finding with the public schools in large Roman Catholic circles, and the manifest disposition to multiply criticisms and controversies and make trouble, out of which grist shall somehow come to the parochial mill. In the general interests of science and freedom and progress, I have more criticism to make upon the Roman Catholic Church than upon any other of our churches. But much more jealous than I am of parochial schools, or of Catholic opposition to the

public schools, or of any Roman Catholic dogmas or aims or methods, am I that Catholic captiousness and unfairness, where they exist, shall not be met with feverish unfairness, but with justice and more than justice — with magnanimity. Arnold of Rugby used to say that the measure of his love for any institution was the measure of his desire to reform it. The measure of my love for any institution is always the measure of my resolution to defend it fairly and only fairly, and of my resentment of mere violent, blind abuse of its enemies or its critics. And it is because my devotion to the American public school is so sincere and so earnest, that I wish to express the hope, as a preface to such critical words as I shall have to speak, that there is not rife in this gathering, or in the association under whose auspices we here come together, anything of that spirit of wholesale, indiscriminate and wild denunciation of the Roman Catholic Church, which has characterized many recent meetings in Boston. However it may be with some of our Protestant clergymen, I trust that there is no woman in this league or in Boston who is bothered by the fear, which bothers one of our Protestant clergymen, that Archbishop Williams is fitting up some dungeons under the new cathedral. I trust there is no woman and no man here present who did not read with indignation and with shame the charge of one of our university professors to one of our large congregations last Sunday, that "Protestant men and women who have Catholic servants in their employ should say to them on the eve of election day that if they intended to vote at the dictation of the priests they must look for work elsewhere." You know what that means. It means the discharge of the man or the woman who don't vote as we do. It means the boycott and the inquisition. The man who talks thus in a time like this abdicates the function of the scholar and advertises himself an unsafe public guide. No Catholic word has been so bad as this. No Catholic word has been so bad as the utterances from the platform of Music Hall last Sunday by the Protestant clergyman whose fulminations there we have become used to. I refer to this, a fair sample of numberless such utter-

ances, simply because I think some of you may not know the pass to which this discussion has come. "The Mass a Roaring Farce" was the reverend gentleman's last Sunday subject, and this interesting episode is reported :

"He took from an envelope a little wafer, like those used in the Catholic Church, remarking that the communicant was not allowed to touch the wine cup, this being retained by the priest, who after the service generally got drunk on what was left. Romanists say that these wafers are the real Christ—these little bits of cracker, which are easily broken, that become lost, that fall in the mud, that are eaten by rats. If, as is claimed, each one of these wafers is Jesus Christ, then there are a hundred thousand Jesus Christs all over the known universe. There is no power in them, shouted the impassioned doctor, as he came to the edge of the platform and bent his body until his head almost touched his knees. If there were, I could not say these things against them. To show you it has no power, I will roll it over and break it."

And we read that the great audience of three thousand people, presumably all Protestant people, citizens of this "Athens of America," presumably graduates of our public schools, here broke into the wildest kind of applause, which lasted fully a minute and started afresh whenever the doctor attempted to resume his remarks. I do not know, ladies and gentlemen, what some of you may think of a spectacle like this in Boston ; I do not think it edifying. It is told of Dr. Johnson that when somebody expounded Berkeley's idealism to him, he brought his big cane or his heavy foot down solidly upon the earth and declared that thus he refuted it; and he has imitators in this method of dealing with metaphysical questions, to this day. But Dr. Johnson would never have got through the freshman year in a theological school without knowing that such a representation of the doctrine of the real presence or of transubstantiation as that here reported is as untrue—the doctrine, when truly stated, is to the minds of most of us a gross error—as the method of representation is vulgar and offensive. Equally offensive and untrue are the representations of the Catholic Church and the Pope of Rome as the targets for sundry very uncomplimentary epithets from certain Old and New Testament prophets—epithets which have been bandied about not a little

by some of our Protestant clergymen in this summer's discussions about the schools. I read a speech by one of our clergymen, at one of the Faneuil Hall or Tremont Temple meetings, which was largely devoted to arguing that the book of Revelation and even the book of Daniel denounce the Pope of Rome; and last Sunday another announced that the "mystery of iniquity" and "that Wicked," spoken of by St. Paul, in Second Thessalonians, was none other than this same Pope of Rome — evidently overlooking the apostle's remark that the said mystery of iniquity "doth already work." Now most of us hate to have a case against us "clinched with Scripture," most of us having a very high regard for the apostles and prophets and desiring to stand well with them. Appeals to the Bible therefore against our adversaries had generally better be as few as possible. So far as the Roman Catholic Church and the Pope are concerned, no thought of either ever entered the head of any Bible writer; the notion that there could have is ridiculous. When you hear any ingenious Protestant clergyman going back to Daniel or Second Thessalonians or the Apocalypse for arguments on the question of parochial schools or of the Boston School Board, I would suggest that you urge him, for the sake of economy in time, to skip that part of his talk.

And we have heard altogether too much in these days about the impossibility of a man being at once a good Catholic and a good American. The answer to such charges is the vast number of sincere and earnest Catholics who are among our most useful, faithful and loyal citizens. If we remember the doctrine of papal infallibility and the papal assertion of the supremacy of the church to the state, and if we press the logic of creeds and definitions to the extreme, we certainly come to a dilemma which the thoughtful Roman Catholic would do well to meditate upon. I fully endorse the conclusions of Mr. Gladstone, in his pamphlet on the Vatican Decrees, even to where he says that "no one can become the convert of Rome without renouncing his moral and mental freedom and placing his civil loyalty and duty at the mercy of another." This, I

say, is the ultimate logic of the doctrine of papal infallibility and of ecclesiastical supremacy. But there is not a single church in the Evangelical Alliance which was represented in the recent remonstrance before the School Board which can abide the logic of its creed. "John Ward" was a Presbyterian who carried his creed into life with the honest relentlessness of the syllogism. I respect John Ward as much as I pity him and hate his creed and its logic. But many who are pledged to his creed do not hesitate to declare his course inhuman, in my ears; and sure it is that if the men who hold his creed should begin to live it out with inexorable logic, Boston would soon become a much worse place to live in than it is ever likely to become as the result of the Roman Catholic doctrine about church and state, to the ultimate logical issues of which doctrine so many of our Protestant clergymen are now endeavoring to crowd their simple Catholic neighbors. If a man did logically and absolutely appropriate the Calvinistic doctrines of total depravity, predestination and the eternal damnation of the majority, which are the nominal and standard doctrines of half the churches belonging to the Evangelical Alliance, I should say that he was an immoral, an inhuman and an irreligious man if he allowed himself to marry the woman he loves and become the father of children. But as matter of fact almost no Calvinist does or ever did hold those doctrines in their naked and logical severity. They are always modified and complemented in life and in thought by other doctrines, often held all unconsciously, by other great imperatives and truths of human nature and currents from the nature of things; and it would never occur to me to say, unless in scholastic disputation, that my neighbor could not be at the same time an honest Presbyterian and a good man. The radical had better not tell his Baptist or Methodist brother too often that he "renounces his mental freedom" when he subscribes to the doctrine of the infallibility of the Bible, as truly as his Catholic brother who accepts the infallibility of the Pope. If the writer of Genesis could make no mistake, why may not Leo XIII also be miraculously shielded? Personally I should expect his

History of the Middle Ages, which is about to be published, to be quite as free from errors as the Jewish books of Judges and Kings. As matter of fact, we know very well that the men who hold the doctrine of the miraculous inspiration of Genesis keep modifying the doctrine so that it shall not bring them into too sharp collision with Kensington and Berlin. And so the deliverances of papal infallibility will always be trimmed or explained away by the common sense of the faithful, whenever sufficiently serious exigencies require. Your Baptist brother, my good friend, cannot, I say, abide extreme and merciless logic; but you will not tell him carelessly that he cannot be a good Baptist and a truthful man. There is scarcely an Episcopalian, clerical or lay, in the circle of my personal acquaintance, who does not tell me that he does not believe in everlasting damnation; yet all pray to be delivered from everlasting damnation at least once a week, doubtless with the feeling of the old lady who preferred to bow at the mention of the Devil in the service — she “thought it was safer.” There is scarcely a month that I do not hear some Unitarian minister approaching the mercy-seat “through Jesus Christ” or asking sundry benefits “for Christ’s sake.” It is habit, tradition, survival. They have no right to these phrases and will frankly tell you, if you ask questions, that they do not accept the doctrine which the phrases unquestionably imply. These practices are certainly very illogical, strictly speaking they are morally indefensible and bad! Yet it would not be right to tell your Unitarian or Episcopal brother of this sort, on the rough, common ground of life, that he is an immoral and a bad man. Do not then, in rough, practical matters, approach your Catholic brother as you have been doing. Neither strict logic nor lack of it settles these questions. When it comes to strict theological discussion, I am as ready to take a hand as anybody, whether it be with the Catholic or the Protestant; but on the plane where we are, I protest against this vast amount of talk about the impossibility of Roman Catholics being good citizens. Nothing in the world can be so offensive to an honorable and patriotic man. The appeal is to facts. We are surrounded by good Catholic citi-

zens. Our regiments in the Civil War were full of good Catholic citizens. The late commander of our army, the hero whom we have just laid to rest, was a good Catholic citizen. One of our Protestant orators, with his pistareen logic about ecclesiastical supremacy, has just been saying that if Sheridan, on his ride from Winchester, had been met by his priest and ordered back, he would have had to turn back and would have turned back. I will tell you what Sheridan would have done. He would have said, "Go to the devil"—that is all. The battle fought and the rebels routed, he might have given ten minutes to the priest, time enough—no more—to give him a safe conduct through the lines and make an appointment for the discussion of ecclesiastical supremacy in the leisure of some summer after the war was ended.

The logic of duty, friends, the dictate of clear truth and justice, of humanity and of honor, is much more imperative and pervasive and reliable, is a much longer logic, than the logic of any Vatican decree, of the Thirty-nine Articles, or of the Westminster Catechism. This is not a good year to say that the Catholic cannot be a good citizen. This is the third centennial of the defeat of the Spanish Armada. The power of the Pope and the fear of the Pope in 1588 were ten times as great as they are today. The jealousy and hatred between Catholic and Protestant, the one or the other still sent to the stake or the gallows, according as the one or the other was in power, were ten times as great in England then as now. It was the year after every Catholic feeling had been inflamed by the execution of Mary Stuart. Probably half England still loved the old church best. Yet when the Spanish Armada, under the special benediction of the Pope, its aim the restoration of the Catholic power in the north of Europe, Elizabeth excommunicated and her subjects declared released from obligations,—when the Spanish Armada came bearing down on England, what Englishman forgot that he was first an Englishman, what Englishman asked whether he was Catholic or Protestant, as he hurried to the camp at Tilbury or until the wreck of the Armada strewed the seas? So it will be always.

Let America once really be in any danger from any Catholic power, and every healthy Catholic in Boston would rush to the recruiting office, snapping his fingers at every papal benediction and every papal anathema that could be read to him. The Catholic today has great respect for the Pope in his place, but if from now on he ventures to meddle unpleasantly with politics, he will be told very sharply, as Ireland has just been telling him, to attend to his own proper offices. So it will be with parochial schools. They will not continue permanently at all. They will continue and will multiply for a time if they succeed in convincing the people that they give a really good education, as good an education as the public schools. But if they do not give a sound, broad and liberal education, but a sectarian, sickly, narrow education, and if this appears to the people, as it will be made to appear if it is the case, then all the encyclicals that can be written cannot bolster them up here in America in this nineteenth century. Every sensible Catholic will see the nonsense of it. He will see that his children will not be qualified to enter this great American life and to succeed in it. He knows too well what the institutions of this country have done for him and for his children, to allow any wool to be pulled over his eyes permanently, to serve any ecclesiastical interests. He will not long continue to hand over his money to build parochial schools, when he can send his children to the better public schools for nothing, without exceedingly solid reasons for it, much better reasons than have yet been given. There will be complaints, there will be revolts, then there will be compromises; and the parochial schools will fade away. A competent Irish authority has just told us, what I believe to be unquestionably the truth, that "if a vote of the Irish-Americans of Massachusetts, especially Boston, was taken, nine tenths would give the public schools the first place." The parochial school is being forced upon the people by the priesthood. The mass of the Catholic people do not want it and do not like it. They will like it less and less every day, and, if we are fair with them, they will not long have it; their clerics will not face the results of too serious a collision.

If any of you are in doubt about the patriotism of your Roman Catholic brethren, you have only to examine the text-books—the histories, the reading-books—used in the parochial schools. Whatever criticism is to be passed upon some of these books—and I have a good deal to say about them presently—the lack of the patriotic element in them cannot be recorded. Many of these books ring with patriotism. The reading-books are as full of patriotic selections as most of the reading-books used in the public schools. They ring too with the spirit of democracy. The history of Ireland for these two long centuries, and the character of the institutions from which most of the Catholic emigrants to America have escaped, have not been such as to make any of them very enthusiastic for monarchies and aristocracies; and they are not enthusiastic and do not teach their children to be. However much “divine right” of bishops there may be in the books, there is no “divine right” of kings. There is much sharp condemnation of tyrannies, much warm approbation of free institutions. Towards this American republic there is especially a feeling of gratitude for a toleration such as Roman Catholics have enjoyed in no Protestant country in Europe. There are pretty constant reminders of the intolerance and the disabilities under which Catholics have suffered in the Protestant world for the last two centuries. And is it to be wondered at? When we reflect upon it, it is a sorry history. The whole Jewish race has been dubbed deicides and treated as deicides for eighteen centuries, because some bigots among them eighteen centuries ago chanced to do what the Christian church has been pretty busy doing from that time to this—turned over to the executioner a heretic who disturbed the peace of Israel. The great mass of the people heard him gladly, and the priests were afraid* to have him arrested openly for fear of the people; yet the whole race has to suffer for it. And the whole body of Roman Catholics in Protestant countries for two centuries have been despised and called by every bad name that could be invented by Protestant ingenuity or raked out of the book of Revelation, been denied almost every political and social privilege, treated

as mere hangers-on in the world, beings existing on sufferance, creatures of hardly the same blood as the Protestant—all in perpetuation of the exceeding great rage, the well warranted and wholesome rage be it said, of our Protestant fathers at the corruptions of the sixteenth century. Look no farther than England. Few liberal historical scholars will deny the political necessities for much of the anti-Catholic legislation in England from the time of Elizabeth to the time of William of Orange, when the lines that defined political and religious parties were so essentially the same. Yet I cannot read the very Bill of Rights without a blush; and the disabilities and oppressions of the Catholics of England and Ireland down almost to our own time constitute one of the most shameful pages in history. Do you say that these wrongs were more political than religious? You have no right to say it until you are ready to say the same of the Inquisition in Spain. About which same Inquisition, damnable enough surely in any case, very extraordinary misconceptions obtain. It is not at all uncommon to meet with the notion that the business of the Inquisition in Spain under Torquemada was to burn Protestants, although Torquemada was dead before there ever was a Protestant and while Luther himself was yet a boy. There may even be some here who would be surprised to learn exactly what prompted Ferdinand in his employment of the Inquisition and of the attitude of Pope Sixtus in the matter.

Before passing from the question of the political disabilities of Catholics in Protestant States, I should like to call attention to the statement which I find repeated in more than one of the Catholic geographies, that in the State of New Hampshire Catholics are still disqualified from holding certain offices. Can it be possible that this is the truth?

In the whole matter of toleration, Protestantism has no better record than the old church. It has simply been the Ins persecuting the Outs—one way in England and Germany, another way in Italy and Spain. Elizabeth's High Commission was only a Protestant Inquisition, and Archbishop Laud was no more tolerant than Torquemada or Catherine de Medici. The

New England Congregationalist will remember that it was not under Mary but under Elizabeth that Copping and Thacker and Penry and Barrowe and Greenwood were hanged, and by James I that our Pilgrim Fathers were "harried out of England." Toleration is not a tenet for which any church is to be thanked. It is a growth of civilization, which simultaneously affects all churches. Toleration is now popular, and I do not think it is likely ever again to become wholly unpopular. These Catholic reading-books are full of enthusiasm for it. These Catholic histories praise nobody quite so much, are quite so proud of nobody else, as Lord Baltimore, the Catholic founder of Maryland, the first American colony established on a basis of perfect tolerance; and they are quite as sincere in their praises of tolerance as some of our Boston Protestant ministers, and no more so. A century hence both parties will be much sincerer about it than they are today; and meantime it is wholesome and helpful that they should assume the virtue and praise it in their reading-books, even if they have it not. A century hence the Protestant party will say less about itself as the promoter of rational progress and inquiry, and the Catholic Church as the one great obstruction to science and the light. One of the Catholic members of the Boston School Board, as will be remembered, recently ventured to deny, in a communication to one of the newspapers, the truth of Mr. Swinton's statement, in his now famous little book, as to the Church's treatment of Galileo. But the facts are notorious; it is folly and fatuity to deny them. But there was nothing remarkable in this treatment of Galileo, nothing that the Catholic need apologize for to the Protestant. What this gentleman should have done was simply to remind the Protestant churches that they were tarred with the same stick. The opposition of the Church in Galileo's time to the teaching that the earth is round was just like the opposition of the Church in ours to the doctrine of evolution. Most of us younger men have been brought up on sermons on Christianity *versus* Darwinism; and until this very latest time, when the doctrine has so thoroughly established itself in the scientific world that loose condemnations of it have become

ridiculous, the professor who ventured to talk evolution in the Protestant theological seminary was quite sure to be dealt with as summarily as Galileo was dealt with by Pope Urban and the Inquisition. Luther pronounced Copernicus's book, which he lived just long enough to read, damnable heresy. The Reformers generally ridiculed, despised and hated Copernicus, who was himself, as you well know, an honored canon in the Catholic Church, his name never anathematized by the Church. From that time to this, Protestantism has fought as surely and steadily as Catholicism every new idea in philosophy, in natural science and in Biblical criticism, which affected its orthodoxy, until the manifest absurdity of its positions compelled retreat and readjustment; and today St. George Mivart has a vastly easier time of it in the Catholic Church than Egbert Smyth at Andover or Professor Woodrow in South Carolina.

It will not be thought, after what I have said, that what I shall proceed to say upon the particular question which has arisen about text-books in our Boston schools, and about which we see this extraordinary excitement among our women, as well as among our men, is inspired by any unjust or unfair feelings toward the Roman Catholic Church. But it is not for this that I have asked your attention to these general considerations. I sincerely trust that I shall never be suspected of any unfair feeling toward any class in the community, and that it will never be necessary for me to give any pledge or proof of a just and impartial temper in dealing with any. I have dwelt upon these general points, because the particular quarrel into which we have been precipitated here in Boston has grown into a general quarrel, and we see the melancholy spectacle of a sort of religious war, Protestant against Catholic. The result is a mass of violent Protestant extravagance, misrepresentation, exaggeration and abuse much more discreditable than the three-column shriek from the Catholic priest in last week's Sunday *Herald* or than any Catholic word which has been spoken. This sort of thing we want to see eliminated from the present controversy. In an account of the work of Bishop England, of South Carolina, in one of these Catholic reading-books, the writer remarks :

"He soon discovered that the Americans, though bitterly prejudiced against Catholics, were yet disposed to be just and even generous. Their hatred of the Church arose from utterly false notions concerning her history and doctrines, and unfortunately the Catholics possessed no means of correcting these erroneous views. The press was in the hands of Protestants, who made use of it to disseminate the most injurious and absurd statements concerning the Church. The great majority of the people had never seen a priest, had never heard a Catholic sermon, had never entered a Catholic church, and had nothing to rely upon but the false traditions which they or their ancestors had brought from England."

I believe that this is still an accurate description of multitudes of American people. I hope that it is not a description of any Boston woman now preparing to vote on the school question. If any such is within the sound of my voice, I advise her to indulge in no general talk about the Roman Catholic Church until she has read at least one good book which authoritatively represents it, until she has read, if she can get nothing better, some of these histories and readers used in the Catholic schools. There is much to criticise in these books, but I think that nine Protestants out of ten will be chiefly surprised at the good that is in them.¹

"The Americans," Bishop England found, "though bitterly prejudiced against Catholics, were yet disposed to be just and even generous." I believe the people of Boston are so disposed today, and to that justice and generosity I appeal and ask you to appeal. To stir that justice and generosity, against the hot and intemperate passion which has been ventilated in many quarters, is why I have here tried to emphasize the points on which the Protestant as Protestant has no right to throw stones at the Catholic, and some of the positive Catholic excellences and services which some are likely to forget. Were I engaged in an apology for the Catholic Church, I should go farther. I should enter the great domain of dogma, and declare on how many points I deem the Catholic doctrine superior to Protestant doctrine. I should tell you that the Catholic doctrine of purgatory, an intermediate state in which

¹ The Catholic text-books can all be found at Noonan & Co.'s, 17 Boylston Street, and probably at any of the Catholic bookstores.

men who are not great saints yet not great sinners are purified and educated for the higher life, is to my thinking a better and a truer doctrine than the sharp Protestant division of all men into celestials and hellians, turned either to eternal beatitude or eternal torment upon the accident of death. I should tell you that the Catholic doctrine of miracle, a doctrine that asserts the perennial power of God in the Church, as able to manifest itself upon occasion at the hands of Ambrose and Francis or of the pious Boston parish priest as at the hands of Peter and Paul and Jesus and "them of old time," is a vastly nobler doctrine than that of our Protestant churches, which recognizes a superannuated supernaturalism and no other. And I should tell you that the Catholic doctrine of inspiration, the doctrine of a Holy Ghost that is living and not dead, a divine spirit whose authentic utterances are still to be heard among men and not simply to be sought for in a book in the library, a Spirit not local, historical, Palestinian, but throbbing, omnipresent, in the Church of God — I should tell you, if you are Protestants, that this doctrine is a sublimer and diviner doctrine than yours. I am not, however, engaged in an apology for the Catholic Church. I am here tonight chiefly to criticise it. Yet it is only as you think upon these things, some of you who have not thought upon them, only as you will do the Catholic Church the justice to judge it by its ideals and its definitions, as well as by its actual perversions, superstitions and narrownesses, that you will come to the present practical political questions in the proper frame of mind, while they are mixed up, as they have now unfortunately become mixed up in Boston, with a general religious controversy.

I do not love the Roman Catholic Church. There is much in it that I bitterly dislike and that I dread. I constantly find it an obstruction in the way of causes which are dear to me. Its general direction, its methods, philosophy, aim and atmosphere are largely repugnant to my ideas. As some of you know, I have spoken more sharply of its bigotries and superstitions, past and present, than I have ever spoken of almost anything else — and I am pretty sure to speak sharply again. I am

always willing to be counted a member of a permanent vigilance committee charged with standing sentry on it. But I will also always stand sentry for it when it is unjustly besieged. I will never be privy to any assault on bigotry by bigotry. Bigotry is bigotry, whether Catholic or Protestant, and we want none of it. We want no religious crusade in the city of Boston. We want to hear no more talk about refusing to vote for this man for the School Board, or to approve that woman as a teacher in the public schools, simply because they are Roman Catholics, until the parochial school movement reaches a stage which in my opinion it is never going to reach. Whenever any decision or instruction goes so far as to compel any Roman Catholic father to withdraw his own children from the public schools, when he comes to think it a sin to send them there or to act as if it were a sin, then surely it will be a sin for him to have a hand in their administration, and his simple manhood will command him to withdraw from the School Board, if he belongs to it, and from the school-room, if he be a teacher. The public school must be in the hands of its friends. No man should be tolerated for a day in the administration of the public schools who is not a believer in them, no man who will not have his own children, if he has children, educated in the public schools and not in any private school, whether a Catholic parochial school at South Boston, an Episcopal parochial school in Brookline, or a private school on the Back Bay.

You are all quite familiar with the particular occasion of the present controversy. But all do not seem to be familiar with the actual words in Swinton's history which have led our school committee to throw that book out of the schools. So intelligent a paper as the *Boston Post*, in an editorial article only two days ago, a very admirable article in the main, referred to the passage as representing an indulgence as "a permission to commit sin." Such a reference as that at this late stage of a discussion which turns on careful definition does not do credit to that excellent newspaper. Much more discreditable is a reference to the note in the same words, in the recent report of the committee on text-books to the School

Board. What are the words of this famous passage? They occur, as most of you know, in connection with a brief general paragraph upon the German Reformation. We are told (p. 320) of the dissatisfaction and complaint which were prevalent at various practical abuses in the Church and at the claims of the popes to interfere in the affairs of the nations, of the resort of Leo X to an extensive sale of indulgences, which in former ages had been a source of large profits to the Church, to recruit his exhausted finances, and of how the offensive manner in which Tetzels, the agent for the sale of these indulgences in Germany, aroused the opposition of Luther, who, first having appealed to the Archbishop of Magdeburg to suppress the traffic, then made his appeal to the people by the publication of his famous ninety-five theses against indulgences, which precipitated the Reformation. And here is the explanatory note :

“These indulgences were, in the early ages of the Church, remissions of the penances imposed upon persons whose sins had brought scandal upon the community. But in process of time they were represented as actual pardons of guilt, and the purchaser of indulgence was said to be delivered from all his sins.”

Well, I maintain that this note states the substantial truth of history. What does the text-book committee say in its recent report? It says that the teacher who used this text-book in the English High School appears to have taught that an indulgence “is a permission to commit sin ;” and it continues—I quote its exact words: “This is not and never was true. It is true that it has been so represented, as the note affirms; but it should add when, where and by whom, and definitely. It certainly never was by any duly recognized authority in the Catholic Church.”

I am not going to enter upon any discussion of the teacher in the High School. That subject is not now on the table, or, if it is, it is quite independent of the subject with which we are concerned. Mr. Swinton is not responsible for Mr. Travis. No author is responsible for the misconceptions or incompetence of any teacher. So far as particular points are concerned, ten times as many mistakes, and ten times as harmful mis-

takes, are made every year by Massachusetts teachers about the treatment of Quakers and Baptists by the early Massachusetts Puritans, about witchcraft, about the character of the Plymouth and Boston colonies, as have ever been made about indulgences and the causes of the Reformation. To urge, as some have urged, that these should not be touched by a teacher or by a text-book, for fear they will not be treated accurately, is to bring us to a pretty pass. It is the author's right to presuppose competent teachers; whenever any teacher proves himself incompetent, it is our right and duty to engage another. It is the author's duty to tell the simple truth; if he does not do this it is our duty to drop his book, and if he does do it it is our duty to sustain him. The capital sin in education is to accommodate ourselves to ignorance, whether on the part of teachers or anybody else. On this policy of the presupposition of incompetence, we shall presently have to leave John Rogers out of the books, lest the boys and their teachers confound him with the Sheffield cutler whose name is on their jack-knives. I am quite ready to say, in a single word, that I think some of Mr. Travis's illustrations, so far as I have examined the matter, extravagant and misleading. I think he may justly have exposed himself to censure or to correction. He certainly did if he spoke in the present tense and not the past, or if historically he represented an indulgence as "a permission to commit sin." As the committee says, this is not and never was true. But it is not true that the note affirms, as the committee says it does, that indulgences have been represented as "permissions to commit sin." It says that they have been represented as "actual pardons of guilt." "It should add," says the committee, "when, where and by whom." Well, I suppose the author acted on the presumption of brains. He is speaking of the abuses in the sale of indulgences, which provoked Luther's protest. In the early ages of the Church, he comments, indulgences had been regarded in a certain way, but in process of time they had become mischievously represented as pardons. The *when*, clearly, is the time of Luther, the time which the author is talking about; the *where* is the ground, at least, with which

Luther was acquainted; the *whom* are the venal churchmen against whom he rose—this is what the boy in the High School, with brains in his head, would understand the note to mean. It would never occur to the boy to think that the mischievous doctrine had been decreed and made orthodox by an œcumenical council, unless that notion was put into his head by an outsider. The mere phrase “in process of time” makes it perfectly clear that it was an abuse which had gradually grown up in the Church. It was certainly competent for the author to explain how long the process of time was, during which this corrupting representation of indulgences had been spreading in the Church; but whether the process was long or short affects no point involved in the controversy. If the abuse existed in Luther’s time, which no man in his senses can deny, the book is vindicated. As matter of fact, the corruption had been spreading for two centuries. It prevailed in England in the time of Wyclif, a century and a half before Luther, and Huss rose against it in Bohemia. It prevailed in Spain and Portugal, in fact, at a time much nearer us than even the time of Luther.

“There is no greater heresy for a man,” protested Wyclif, “than to believe that he is absolved from sin if he give money, or because a priest layeth his hand on his head and saith, ‘I absolve thee; *for thou must be sorrowful in thy heart, else God does not absolve thee.*’” “It is plain to me,” he said again, “that our prelates in granting indulgences do commonly blaspheme the wisdom of God, pretending in their avarice and folly that they understand what they really know not. They chatter on the subject of grace as if it were a thing to be bought and sold like an ass or an ox; by so doing they learn to make a merchandise of selling pardons, the devil having availed himself of an error in the schools to introduce after this manner heresies in morals.”

These words of Wyclif’s would have no meaning if this “selling pardons” were not rife all about him. The Prologue to the *Canterbury Tales* shows quite sufficiently that it was rife. Chaucer was Wyclif’s contemporary, perhaps his friend, although Catholics claim that he was a good Catholic. Read his description of “the Pardoner,” in the Prologue:

“His wallet lay before him in his lap,
Brimful of pardons come from Rome all hot,” etc.

And Chaucer, who satirizes these corrupt "pardoners" as sharply as Wyclif himself does, lets us know that the whole country, "from Berwick unto Ware," was full of them. Must Chaucer and the poets follow the historians out of the schools? Wyclif's powerful *De Ecclesia* is full of indignant condemnation of the venal representations of indulgence by the English priests and bishops; and Huss, in his strong tractate against indulgences, used almost Wyclif's very words and almost the very words which Luther used after him. If any of you will read Loserth's learned work on *Wyclif and Huss*, and especially the chapter on the Controversies on Indulgences in Prague in the year 1412, you will almost think yourself reading the story of Tetzel and Luther at Wittenberg, so identical is the collision, so Tetzel-like the seller of indulgences with his drum and money-boxes, so Luther-like the great Bohemian Protestant. "All that I have thus far taught," Luther said himself, at the time of his excommunication, "I have learned from John Huss, but without knowing it." So gross was the abuse which was made of indulgences in Prague on the part of the Romish Curia, Loserth informs us, that "not only the friends but also the opponents of Huss were constrained to raise their voice." The King of Bohemia complained to the Pope that his dealers "promise heaven to all that will yield up their gold." Huss himself says that Palecz, one of the pillars of the Church in Prague, admitted the palpable errors in the articles of indulgence. Of what sort were these errors? They could be of but one sort. They made the articles of indulgence, most perilous at best, appear still more completely "actual pardons for guilt." How did Huss enlist the sympathies of the bright students in the university, if he had no case? How did Luther so easily win and hold the ardent sympathies of the Wittenberg students, if he was simply manufacturing his charges against Tetzel and the Church?

But I think no member of our text-book committee would venture to deny the shameless abuse of indulgences in Germany in 1517. It is not necessary to go to a Protestant partisan, like D'Aubigné, for our history, although I am not

impugning D'Aubigné. Go to Ranke, so impartial that he has been accused in Germany of writing history from a Catholic point of view. Ranke, says his Catholic French translator, "guards and defends the church and its heads against unjust attacks and multiplied slanders, intelligently appreciates their position, their mission, and their duties. His *History of the Papacy* will do more for the cause of religion than Le Maistre's book, which has so many charms for the Catholic." Well, Ranke observes that the Reformation "may be said to have originated in the violent shock which Luther's religious feelings received from the sale of indulgences." But what was it in this that so shocked Luther? Ranke describes what it was in very short and sharp words — "the doctrine of a forgiveness of sins to be had for money." And Ranke, ladies and gentlemen, perhaps the most learned and impartial historian of our time — Ranke is a bad man to wrestle with. Read his chapter on the "Secularization of the Church," in his *History of the Papacy*, for the general setting of Luther's time. Then read his *German History in the Time of the Reformation*, read simply the second book of the first volume, to let Ranke show you the frightfully mercenary interpretation of the doctrine of indulgence which had come about even before Tetzel's time, and then show you how Tetzel himself was — these are his own words — "the most shameless of all the commissioners." But how "shameless?" I ask again. It could be but in one way, I answer — by making the indulgences, most perilous at best, appear still more completely "actual pardons for guilt." Indulgences, like a multitude of the ceremonies and rules of the Church, were prostituted to mere money-making. Where was there a more zealous Catholic than Cardinal Ximenes? Yet even he in 1513 opposed the attempt to introduce the sale of indulgences into Spain; "for there was not a doubt in the mind of any reasonable man," says Ranke, "that all these demands were mere financial speculations."

But we do not have to depend upon second-hand information in this matter. Erasmus's *Praise of Folly* is in the libraries — and Erasmus was a Catholic. Ulrich von Hutten can

still be read. Luther's Ninety-five Theses are still extant. Luther's letter to the Archbishop of Magdeburg, complaining of the manner in which Tetzel and his associates were carrying on "their scandalous traffic," as he describes it, is still extant. Luther's sermon to his own people at Wittenberg, preached weeks before he nailed his theses to the church door, is still extant, and you may read the synopsis of it, not in the Protestant D'Aubigné, but in the Catholic Audin :

"They say," he said, "that indulgences, applied to the soul that suffers in purgatory, are imparted to it, and accounted for in the remission of the sins for which it should still suffer." "If you have anything to spare," he says again, "give it, in the Lord's name, for the building of St. Peter's at Rome, but do not *purchase pardons*." "I complain bitterly," he wrote to the archbishop, "of the fatal errors in which these men are involving the common people, men of weak understanding, whom, foolish as they are, these men persuade that they will be sure of salvation if they only buy their letters of plenary indulgence. They believe that souls will fly out of purgatory the moment that the money paid for their redemption is thrown into the preacher's bag, and that such virtue belongs to these indulgences that there is no sin which the indulgences will not absolutely and at once efface."

I could continue quoting such arraignments from Luther till midnight. These arraignments of the mechanical, venal character of indulgences and of absolution at the time constitute the whole sum and substance of his quarrel with the Church at the beginning. They were prompted by the dangerous errors into which he saw his own people were falling. They were made on the very ground where the bad business was going on ; made by a man who, intense and violent and often coarse, was profoundly earnest and religious, not a careless and irresponsible talker, but the most learned and powerful professor in the university ; and the justice and crying need of the arraignments were instantly recognized by almost every serious scholar in the university and every serious man in the community. It was not with the doctrine of indulgence as such that Luther quarreled at first, although afterwards he attacked the whole system. In his very Ninety-five Theses he said (see theses 71 and 72), "Cursed be whosoever speaks

against the Pope's indulgence . . . but blessed be he who opposes the foolish and reckless speeches of the preachers of indulgence." Even in the explanation which he published after his conversation with Miltitz, he still admits the doctrine of indulgences in a certain sense. As what less then could indulgences have been represented by clerics of the Tetzelsort, against whom Luther rose, than pardons, delivering their purchasers from the just penalties of sin? The whole commotion at Wittenberg has no meaning, the beginning of the Reformation has no explanation, unless the doctrine of indulgences was being represented and was being understood in the churches around Wittenberg substantially as "the doctrine of a forgiveness of sins to be had for money."

The text-book committee incorporates in its recent report a strict definition of an indulgence from a recognized Roman Catholic authority. That definition is correct. The following definition by our own Dr. Hedge is also correct, and it is more profitable for us to listen to, because it shows how easy is the corruption of the doctrine, a dangerous one at best, and the natural point of transition to those abuses which Ranke and Swinton and the various historians record and against which Wyclif and Huss and Luther rose in protest:

"Indulgence, according to the theory of the Church, was dispensation from the penance otherwise required for priestly absolution. It was not pretended that priestly absolution secured divine forgiveness and eternal salvation. It was absolution from temporal penalties due to the Church; but popular superstition identified the one with the other. Moreover, it was held that the supererogatory merits of Christ and the saints were available for the use of sinners. They constituted a treasury confided to the Church, whose saving virtue the head of the Church could dispense at discretion. In this case the application of that fund was measured by pecuniary equivalents. Christ had said, 'How hardly shall they that have riches enter the kingdom of heaven.' Leo said in effect, 'How easily may they that have riches enter the kingdom of heaven,' since they have the *quid pro quo*. For the poor it was not so easy; and this was one aspect of the case which stimulated the opposition of Luther. Penitence was nominally required of the sinner, but proofs of penitence were not exacted. Practically, the indulgence meant impunity for sin. A more complete travesty of the gospel—laughable if not so impious—could hardly be conceived. The

faithful themselves were shocked by the shameless realism which characterized the proclamations of the German commissioner, Tetzl.¹

"Practically," says Dr. Hedge, "the indulgence meant impunity for sin." The familiar story told by more than one of the old German chroniclers, and passed on by the Lutheran historians, has much the same significance, whether myth or fact, as showing the short and natural logic of the common man—the story of the Saxon gentleman who heard Tetzl at Leipzig, and bargained with him for thirty crowns for a letter of indulgence that should cover him in a revenge he meant to take upon a man who had defrauded him. Armed with this, the story goes, he, with his servants, presently fell upon Tetzl in a wood between Jüterboch and Treblin, gave him a beating and took away his chest; and Duke George, who appreciated the situation, good-naturedly let him off for it. The terribly mechanical aspect of the matter appears, the slight stress which was laid upon the penitence part of the transaction, in the fact that one could not only buy indulgences for his own sins, but also for his friends in purgatory, who were quite beyond the reach of his lowly and contrite heart or of any spiritual influence of the Church. An indulgence, if it does not free the soul from guilt, remits the punishment

¹ "The theory of indulgence may be said to resolve itself into the two positions: (1) that, after the remission of the eternal punishment due for sin, there remains due to the justice of God a certain amount of temporal pain to be undergone, either before death in this world or after death in purgatory; (2) that this pain may be remitted by the application of the superabundant merits of Christ and of the saints out of the treasury of the Church, the administration of which treasury is the prerogative of the hierarchy. It must carefully be borne in mind that, in Roman Catholic orthodoxy, indulgence is never absolutely gratuitous, and that those only can in any circumstances validly receive it who are in full communion with the Church, and have resorted to the sacrament of penance, in which alone, after due contrition and confession, provision is made for the remission of the graver penalty of sin. The doctrine of indulgences, however, is singularly open to misunderstanding; and in its practical applications it has too often been used to sanction the most flagrant immorality. The scandalous abuses connected with the 'pardoners' trade, and in particular the reckless conduct of the hawkers of the papal indulgence granted to those who should contribute funds for the completion of St. Peter's, Rome, were, as is well known, very prominent among the proximate causes of the Protestant Reformation."—*Encyclopædia Britannica*, article on *Indulgence*.

"The plenary indulgence for all, the alleged object of which was to contribute to the completion of the Vatican Basilica, restored the possessor

due for guilt. I speak now of indulgences according to their strict definition. And to most men forgiveness is simply escape from punishment. To be pardoned is to be let out of State prison. Orthodoxy unquestionably demanded penitence in connection with the granting of indulgence. But the abuse of the doctrine, the inevitable and indisputable abuse, brought about a state of things with reference to the punishments in purgatory to which a man's sins had justly exposed him like that which would obtain in Court Square if the judge could say to the moneyed thief, "I waive imprisonment for a thousand dollars, on condition of your sincere regrets." I wish to say just here that to my mind such a state of things does obtain to a great extent in the great inequality with which our system of fines applies to the poor and the rich — and some of the evils of it are very like some of the evils of indulgences. You will say that the sinner buying his indulgence knew that he was dealing with the divine powers, whose arms are very long, who

to the grace of God, and completely exempted him from the punishment of purgatory. But there were three other favors to be obtained by further contributions: the right of choosing a father confessor who could grant absolution in reserved cases, and commute vows which had been taken into other good works; participation in all prayers, fasts, pilgrimages, and whatever good works were performed in the church militant; lastly, the release of the souls of the departed out of purgatory. In order to obtain plenary indulgence, it was necessary not only to confess but to feel contrition; the three others could be obtained without contrition or confession, by money alone. It is in this point of view that Columbus extols the worth of money; 'he who possesses it,' says he seriously, 'has the power of transporting souls into Paradise.' Never indeed was the union of secular objects with spiritual omnipotence more strikingly displayed than in this epoch. There is a fantastic sublimity and grandeur in this conception of the Church as a community comprehending heaven and earth, the living and the dead; in which all the penalties incurred by individuals were removed by the merit and the grace of the collective body. What a conception of the power and dignity of a human being is implied in the belief that the Pope could employ this accumulated treasure of merits in behalf of one or another at his pleasure! The doctrine that the power of the Pope extended to that intermediate state between heaven and earth, called purgatory, was the growth of modern times. The Pope appears in the character of the great dispenser of all punishment and all mercy. And this most poetical, sublime idea he now dragged in the dust for a miserable sum of money, which he applied to the political or domestic wants of the moment. Mountebank itinerant commissioners, who were very fond of reckoning how much they had already raised for the papal court, while they retained a considerable portion of it for themselves, outstripped their powers with blasphemous eloquence. They thought themselves armed against every attack, so long as they could menace their opponents with the tremendous punishments of the Church."— *Ranke*.

look through all pretenses and disguises, and with whom it is not safe to juggle. Yes, you can say that. But the Wittenberg sinner did not say it, and the system did not encourage him to think it. Ultimate issues and the divine powers were a very long way off, and pretty thoroughly discounted by the great mass of intermediaries. It was a system of extreme vicariousness from top to bottom, and Tetzel's indulgences were its *reductio ad absurdum*. One form of the indulgence was that whereby a man paid so much for the intercessory efforts in his behalf of the saints and the general heavenly host, and with these intercessions your Wittenberg butcher and baker in 1517 felt extremely safe, attaching quite as high an efficacy to them as to a lowly and penitent heart. The prayer-books of the time are one index to the state of things. There are prayers to which an indulgence for 146 days, others to which one for 7,000 or 8,000 years, are attached. If a prayer was so efficacious, what might not the superstitious votary be encouraged to hope from thirty crowns?

Tetzel was unquestionably an extreme man, as bad perhaps as the system could produce; but him, and many who, if not as brazen in the traffic, were just as corrupt, it did produce and long sustain. Ultimately his own party was forced to abandon him. Miltitz, the papal nuncio, in 1518, after Luther's vigorous onslaughts had made the scandals notorious and roused Germany, censured Tetzel in the name of the Pope, pronouncing "the most entire and distinct disapprobation of the scandalous proceedings of the venders of indulgence;" and his general opinion of him appears from the fact of his writing to Pfeffinger of "the lies and frauds of this Tetzel." The whole Catholic party began straightway to feel the force of Luther's unsparing exposures and to take steps to reform itself from within; but the tendencies of Tetzel's time must not for an instant be confounded, as many Catholic writers seek to confound them in the popular mind, with the direction of things at the Council of Trent, which latter was really mainly owing to the stern rebukes by men like Luther of the corruptions here considered.

It should not excite surprise that the doctrine of indul-

gences had sunk to this low form in the common understanding and in common usage, when we consider the general corruption of the Church at the time. I could take up a dozen doctrines and show you that they had sunk quite as low, when measured either by the authoritative doctrinal definitions, by the practice of the Catholic Church in earlier times, or by the practice of the Church in Boston today. The corruption of the Church, both in point of popular doctrine and in point of morals, was such as the world never saw before nor since. I do not ask you to take D'Aubigné's word for it. I do not ask you even to take Ranke's word for it. Read the general accounts by the Catholic Audin, and his particular admission of the abuse of the indulgences. Read the words of Cardinal Julian, at the Council of Basle, on the disorders among the German clergy. Most important of all, take the evidence of honest Pope Adrian VI, the successor of Leo X, crowned in 1522, when Germany was all ablaze with Lutheranism. At the diet of Nuremberg, summoned to deal with Luther, this honest Dutch Pope Adrian declared roundly, through his legate, that

"these disorders had sprung from the sins of men, more especially from the sins of priests and prelates. Even in the holy chair," said he, "many horrible crimes have been committed. The contagious disease, spreading from the head to the members, from the Pope to lesser prelates, has spread far and wide, so that scarcely any one is to be found who does right and who is free from infection."

If any fact in history stands avouched, it is that the most mechanical and venal interpretation of the doctrine of indulgence had become prevalent in the Church in 1517, and that this was the immediate occasion of the Lutheran Reformation. The Roman Catholic Church for two centuries before that time has a bad record. It is a desire that that bad record shall be covered up, that it shall be kept as much as possible out of sight and out of remembrance — this, and not any honest fear that teachers in our Boston schools will be telling their boys that Archbishop Williams or Leo XIII issues licenses to commit sin — which is the motive of the present Catholic opposition to Mr. Swinton's history. We all of us, ladies and gentlemen,

have a rather mixed and impure religious pedigree. We have all at times, I fear, been miserable sinners. Church of England people cannot be very proud of Henry VIII, of sundry proceedings on the part of Archbishop Whitgift, of the general moral condition of the Church at the time of the Wesleyan revival, of the system of church "livings," of the fact that a lot of their bishops today derive large revenues from the rents of grog-shops, of the perversions and extravagances of doctrine which have obtained and obtain today in large sections of the Church. The New England Congregationalist is not proud of the dealings with Quakers and Baptists and witches on the part of his ancestors, though his ancestors were no worse in this than other people at the time. The Boston Unitarian is not very proud, I take it, of the attitude of his father toward Emerson and Theodore Parker. But the Roman Catholic is haunted to a much greater extent than other people by the hobgoblin of consistency. His whole theory of his miraculously inspired and guided and shielded church compels an excessive anxiety to show a good record. But, ladies and gentlemen, the record is very streaked and speckled. The record is blackest at the time when Luther was born in Germany. Among the abuses of that time none was more flagrant than the utterly mechanical and venal ideas of indulgences which were encouraged and which prevailed among the clergy and among the people. We are not teaching our children honest history, we are not showing them the justification or the explanation of one of the greatest movements in history, of the very central and most influential movement in all modern history, if we blot that fact from their books. In consenting to remove Swinton's text-book from our public schools, the School Board of the City of Boston has allowed itself to serve the interests of ignorance, of narrow prejudice, and of a restive, thin-skinned, finikin sectarianism. I say nothing of motives—I know well what good motives and what conscientious care there have been on the part of men whose conclusions I do not approve—but this, I say, is how history will record the fact. And history will remember that when this test-case was thus settled by the

votes of fourteen men — 10 Catholics, 3 Protestants, 1 Jew — there stood up in protest two women. I do not say they knew more than these others, I do not say they were more conscientious, I do not say they had thought more about the matter; but I say history will remember that there stood up in protest these two women.

The text-book committee inform us, ladies and gentlemen, that before Swinton's history was dropped from the schools, the attention of the publishers was called to the defective character of the note, and imply that if the note could have been properly corrected the book would have been retained. I should like to know how serious an effort was made to this end. I should like to know what correction the committee would have deemed proper. I venture to say that if the publishers of the book can be shown tomorrow that there is any real likelihood of the note being understood in the schools as referring to today and not to the sixteenth century, any likelihood of its being understood to relate to any doctrinal standard or to present practice, the note will be expanded instantly. But I also venture to say that the more the note is expanded in fidelity to the truth of history, the more explicit the account is made of the abuses which provoked the Reformation, the more the book will be condemned by those who instigated the present opposition.¹

¹ On the day on which I spoke (Oct. 1) there appeared a communication in the Boston *Herald*, which I had not read, from a prominent member of the School Board, Mr. E. C. Carrigan, containing information of very great significance upon this point. Mr. Carrigan is a man with Irish blood in his veins, and has expressed very warm and very proper resentment at the deluge of indiscriminate denunciation which has been poured out upon "Irish Catholics" by Protestant orators in Boston this summer. Whether he is himself a Roman Catholic or not I do not know. At any rate, his traditions and affiliations give him exceptional opportunities to understand the Catholic position. What more concerns us here, he is an earnest and energetic supporter of the public school system. "The establishment of parochial schools in Massachusetts" he declares to be "a most serious mistake, if not a great misfortune, especially to those who attend them, and that schools wholly supported and controlled by the people are the best schools for the children of all the people." Nothing in the present torrent of abuse, he tells his fellow-citizens of Irish ancestry, should be allowed to weaken their faith or interest in the American common school, "wherein the children of all Irish parents have an equal chance with others to secure the greatest prize of life, an education which fits them for citizenship and to successfully compete in the great business and professional world." Speaking of

I should never have known, had not the present controversy prompted me to a critical examination, how excellent a book this little history of Swinton's is. I have been especially impressed by the impartiality and the rare tact with which the author steers through those stormy periods where Catholicism and Protestantism clashed—the time of the Huguenots and St. Bartholomew's, the time of Alva in the Netherlands, the religious persecutions, now Catholic, now Protestant, under Henry VIII and Mary and Elizabeth. I should like especially to speak of Swinton's warm recognition of the services of the Catholic Church during the Middle Ages. I should like to

Swinton's history, he says, "No topic of such importance as the Reformation, whether taught from a text-book or orally, should be presented other than fairly, fully, impartially, so that the student may have as clear and as intelligent understanding of this subject as others in general history, whether it displeases a priest, preacher, parson or other citizen." He shows conclusively, I think, exaggerations and errors on the part of the teacher in the High School; although his apology for the dropping of Swinton's text-book, "simply and solely because imperfect teaching resulted from its use," is certainly a very poor apology. Mr. Carrigan has probably had a larger experience in connection with the public schools, perhaps knows more personally about the public schools, than any other member of the present Boston School Board. And he is, as I have said, an energetic man. While the text-book committee was telling us that the publishers of Swinton's history refused to change the offending note about indulgences, Mr. Carrigan was in New York reading the page in a proposed new edition of the book, submitted to him by the publishers, in which the note is changed. And how changed? Here is the text of the new note, as he gives it:

"Indulgences were authorized by the councils of the Church as a remission of the temporal penances imposed for sins; and, in the theory of the Church, they always presupposed confession and repentance on the part of the sinner."

If it be true that the author and the publishers of the book have agreed to a change like this, omitting the reference to the abuses of the doctrine in the time of Luther, which was the one point of moment, they have done it to satisfy the Catholic demand. And if this is the Catholic demand, then what I have declared above is strictly confirmed—that the motive of the Catholic opposition to the book is simply the desire to cover up a bad chapter in the history of the Church, the desire that the children in the schools shall not learn that Luther had sufficient provocation and Protestantism its justification. The *theory* of the Church is not the question; the *practice* of the Church in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries is the question. If the charge which I here make is not true, then let the Catholic opposition declare that the following note would satisfy them:

Indulgences, as authorized by the councils of the Church in early ages, were remissions of the temporal penances imposed for sins. In the theory of the Church, they presupposed confession and repentance on the part of the sinner; but in process of time they had become widely represented in the Church as actual pardons, and the purchaser of indulgence was said to be delivered from the punishment due for his sins. This gross abuse aroused Luther and thus brought on the Protestant Reformation.

quote his high tribute to the monasteries, which were the arks of learning and the centers of almost every civilizing influence left in those dark and troublous centuries succeeding the breaking up of the old Roman system. "The Church," he says, "was the bridge across the chaos, and linked the two periods of ancient and modern civilization."

I quote this passage for a special reason. It is for saying the same thing that one of the members of our school committee, Dr. Duryea, was held up to execration yesterday on the platform of Music Hall by the passionate Protestant whom I have once quoted. Dr. Duryea, as scarcely needs be said to this audience, was quite right. He was only saying what every scholar knows perfectly well, what not to know proclaims a man in so far uneducated. This passionate Protestant went farther. He circulated a petition, which he asked every man, woman and child to sign, urging Dr. Duryea, inasmuch as "he lacks either the intelligence necessary to formulate a correct opinion concerning indulgences as taught by popes and practiced by priests, or the honesty and bravery to tell the truth," to resign his place on the School Board and "give place to a better educated or more truth-loving man." Well, I think Dr. Duryea's conclusions regarding Mr. Swinton's book erroneous. He does not read history as I do, or he is affected by considerations which I know nothing of. But the opinion concerning indulgences talked of by the gentlemen at Music Hall was never taught by any pope with whose teachings I am acquainted; and a resolution such as this of which we read is a disgrace to any man who talks of education and the love of truth. The acme of disgrace is reached when children are exhorted to enlist in this religious warfare.

There has been altogether too much arraignment of the motives of Rev. Dr. Duryea here in Boston in these last days, some of them in places where we have a right to expect better things than we expect from the platform of Music Hall. I have even heard him criticised for saying, what would seem to be obvious to the narrowest intelligence, that he felt his daughters to be safer in Boston for the sake of the Roman Catholic

Church. Do these critics realize what the Roman Catholics of Boston would be, if their religion and their Church were taken away from them tomorrow? There seems to be an agreement in some quarters, one is sometimes tempted to think, that nothing good and anything bad may be said of the Roman Catholic. Some of our clergy have recently set out to describe the personal immoralities of certain Roman Catholics in Boston. Without doubt a melancholy catalogue could be made. And a bad enough catalogue could be made of Baptist adulterers and Episcopal embezzlers and Universalist tipplers. Let us not make that catalogue this year. And let there be less hasty talk about men's motives in complex matters like the present. Let us deal with facts as clearly and sharply as we please, but let us leave each man's conscience to himself. If I felt sure that half of those who have to deal with this matter brought to it half the conscientiousness and half the open-mindedness of Dr. Duryea, I should be twice as hopeful as I am of the right issue.

How do our Catholic brethren treat Luther and the Reformation? What do they teach their children in their own schools? Well, here is one of their histories, a very popular one, by Gazeau.¹ Here the protest against indulgences and the outbreak of the Reformation are made to appear as the result of Luther's jealousy and indignation that the sale of indulgences was not intrusted to his order, the Augustinians, instead of to Tetzel and the Dominicans. He was angry and mortified too that the people deserted his pulpit and flocked to hear Tetzel. Gilmour and others similarly ascribe Luther's movement to his indignation and pique at the "slight" put upon him and the Augustinians in not being intrusted with Tetzel's office. Tetzel is praised by Gazeau as an eloquent and learned man, who responded to Luther with "a masterly defense,"—which, as the author truly remarks, the students of Wittenberg burned in the university square. Why did they burn it? The reason assigned by our author is their dislike of "free speech." There

¹ *Modern History*. Adapted from the French of the Rev. P. F. Gazeau, S. J. New York: The Catholic Publication Society. 1887.

is not one word of condemnation of Tetzl and the abuse of indulgences. There is only praise for Tetzl, and his success is declared to be a proof of "the faith and the devotion of the people." Luther is represented as an altogether unscrupulous and turbulent fellow.

"Wicked men," says the author, "are always disposed to rebel against authority. The sale of indulgences and the word 'reform' were simply made the pretext by the able but unprincipled Luther for the outburst of the storm that was to devastate Europe and break up the spiritual unity of Christendom."

The general religious condition of Europe, as here painted, at the time when Luther rose is something very beautiful, almost idyllic.

"Christian Europe was at peace, forming but one great family, numbering as many members as there were nations. Notwithstanding dynastic troubles and national rivalries, all Christendom was united by one creed around a common altar and in obedience to the same infallible spiritual authority, the Vicar of Jesus Christ. The head of the Church, venerated as the universal father of the faithful, sent zealous missionaries to the idolatrous races of the New World, while in Europe he exerted his influence to encourage learning and to mature Christian civilization."

It was surely a pity to break into that delightful calm with potherring doctrine of justification by faith! What was this doctrine of "justification by faith?" Why, it was a doctrine, we learn, that, "provided men *believed* in Christ, it mattered little what they *did*," and thus "justified all evil actions." And this was specially dangerous "at a time when laxity of morals widely prevailed"—for it is admitted that abuses "certainly existed," that the lives of many of the clergy were scandalous, and that the general state of morals was bad. But why was this? And who shall blame anybody for any definition of transubstantiation, after this definition of justification by faith? Time forbids the citation of all the characterizations of Luther which follow, and which altogether could leave in the mind of a boy or girl only the impression of some monster little removed from Bluebeard.

"The pretended reformer respected the laws of morality no more than

those of justice." "To justify his enormities he said that he was inspired by heaven." "No one can peruse without a blush of shame and indignation the coarse jests, the buffoonery, and the indecencies with which his works are sullied." "It is difficult to conceive," concludes the author, "how such a leader could have found followers, were it not known what power passion, pride, money and pleasure have over the human heart." Protestantism spread rapidly because it "pandered to corrupt nature."

And this explains the success of Luther and the Reformation! And "it is very important," as our author says, "that students should have a clear conception and knowledge of the causes that led to this revolt." Ladies and gentlemen, do we want Mr. Swinton's note expanded in that direction? Does this satisfy Father Metcalf's scrupulous anxiety for exact historical truth?

Let me hasten to say that this is perhaps the worst of the histories which I have examined. But this is a very popular history, and others are almost as bad. It is not this which misrepresents Luther's marriage, or describes Calvin as a man expelled from the university on account of his immoralities, or John Knox as a "bad priest," or as "the ruffian of the Reformation."

These books by Fredet and by Spalding, popular books in the schools, give a far truer idea of the abuses which provoked the Reformation than does this other. As to the man Martin Luther, his defense among Catholic scholars may be left to the fine and fair minds of their own number, men like Stolberg and Schlegel. Stolberg, in his strictures upon Luther's doctrines, "would not cast a stone" at his person. "In Luther," he said, "I honor not alone one of the grandest spirits that has ever lived, but a great religiousness also, which never forsook him." This for scholars—but who shall protect the children? Luther was coarse—it was a coarse time; he did jest; there is buffoonery. But as these things here appear, they are not true; and here they should not be spoken of at all.

Here is a history—a *History of the World*, by John MacCarthy,¹ a book of the same scope as Swinton's, to

¹ *History of the World, for Schools and Colleges.* By John MacCarthy. New York: The Catholic Publication Society. 1887.

which I wish to pay almost unqualified praise. It admits many things discreditable to Catholics, which Swinton passes. It mentions the fact, which Swinton passes, that a *Te Deum* was sung in Rome, by order of Pope Gregory XIII, in honor of the Massacre of St. Bartholomew's, although it makes a lame apology for it. Its account of Luther and the Reformation is almost entirely admirable, intelligent, spirited and almost wholly just, a vastly better account than that in the history which I understand is probably to supersede Swinton in our schools; I ask you to compare the two.¹ It is a book which I would willingly and gladly place in the hands of my own boy, if I had one. I do not think I could myself write a more impartial book. An exceedingly good book too is Hassard's *History of the United States*.²

I wish that I might enter upon a more searching examination here of the text-books used in the Catholic schools. I want to have you understand just what kind of history the scrupulous sticklers for exact truth who are troubled by Mr. Swinton do approve, what kind of things they would have children think have come about "in the process of time." I shall hope for some early opportunity to bring this subject more fully before our public, if not in another address, then in the newspapers. These books are not without excellences, but on the whole the examination of them has been a depressing business. There is no book among them worse than this exceedingly popular *Bible History*, with an appendix of Church History, by one of the bishops of the Church, Bishop Gilmour of Cleveland,³ a book commended by the Pope, by Cardinal Manning, and by almost every leading American dignitary; in fact, there is no other book which prints so many or such imposing commenda-

¹ Anderson's notice of the Reformation is ridiculously timid and inadequate. Luther and his protest are mentioned almost as a by-the-by under the reign of Charles V. No account whatever is given of the subject of indulgences. Luther's Ninety-five Theses are said to have been directed against "the doctrines of the Catholic Church," a most careless and incorrect statement.

² *History of the United States of America, for the Use of Schools.* By John R. G. Hassard. New York: The Catholic Publication Society. 1887.

³ *Bible History, Containing the most Remarkable Events of the Old and New Testaments To which is added a Compendium of Church History. For the Use of the Catholic Schools in the United States.* By Right Reverend Richard Gilmour, D.D., Bishop of Cleveland. New York, Cincinnati and Chicago: Benziger Brothers, Printers to the Holy Apostolic See.

tions. It is a thoroughly bad book. I should like to read you much from it. I will read a single paragraph, from the close of the account of the reigns of the Tudors, in which the persecutions under Henry and Elizabeth are made so much of, and the vastly bloodier career of Mary is not mentioned. "To make converts," the author tells his young readers,

"Catholicity has ever appealed to reason; Protestantism, like Mohammedanism, to force and violence. In England and Scotland Protestantism was forced upon the people by fines, imprisonment and death; in Germany and Prussia, Sweden and Denmark and Norway, the same. In America the Puritans acted in like manner."

Ladies and gentlemen, did you ever read the Edict of 1550, with which Alva went armed into the Netherlands? Let me read you a brief passage from it, for two reasons:

"No one," said the Edict, "shall print, write, copy, keep, conceal, sell, buy or give in churches, streets, or other places, any book or writing made by Martin Luther, John Ecolampadius, Ulrich Zwinglius, Martin Bucer, John Calvin, or other heretics reprobated by the Holy Church; . . . nor break or otherwise injure the images of the Holy Virgin or canonized saints; . . . nor in his house hold conventicles or illegal gatherings, or be present at any such in which the adherents of the above-mentioned heretics teach, baptize, and form conspiracies against the Holy Church and the general welfare. . . . Moreover, we forbid," continues the Edict, "all lay persons *to converse or dispute* concerning the Holy Scriptures, openly or secretly, especially on any doubtful or difficult matters, or *to read, teach, or expound the Scriptures*, unless they have duly studied theology and been approved by some renowned university; . . . or to preach secretly or openly, or to *entertain* any of *the opinions* of the above-mentioned heretics; . . . on pain, should any one be found to have contravened any of the points above mentioned, as perturbators of our state and of the general quiet to be punished in the following manner."

And how were they to be punished? The Edict went on to provide that such perturbators of the general quiet are to be executed, to wit: the men with the sword and the women to be buried alive, if they *do not* persist in their errors; if they do persist in them, then they are to be executed with fire; all their property in both cases being confiscated to the crown. The Edict further provided that any who failed to betray a suspected heretic, or who lodged or entertained any such, or furnished any with food, fire or clothing, should be liable to the same

punishment as if suspected or convicted themselves. All who knew of any persons tainted with heresy were required to denounce them, on pain of severe punishment; and the most ignoble principle of human nature was appealed to in the further provision "that *the informer*, in case of conviction, should be entitled to one half the property of the accused, if not more than one hundred pounds Flemish; if more, then ten per cent of all such excess." Treachery to one's friends was encouraged by the provision, "that if any man, being present at any secret conventicle, shall afterwards come forward and betray his fellow-members of the congregation, he shall receive full pardon;" whereas it was ordered that if any person, of whatsoever condition, should ask for the pardon of any condemned heretic or present any petition in favor of any, or if any one having authority should grant any pardon or favor, he should be declared forever incapable of civil and military office, and be in danger of severe punishment besides.

You will say, perhaps, that Holy Church and Holy Philip did not really mean this. They meant to terrorize the Netherlands by hanging up this frightful proclamation, but it is against all conscience and all humanity that they should carry it out. My friends, during the six years of Alva's government in the Netherlands, his executioners put to death 18,000 persons, to say nothing of the victims in cities captured by his troops or the hosts that fell in battles.

I read this edict, I say, for two reasons: as an illustration of the Catholic "appeal to reason," as opposed to the Protestant methods of "violence and force;" and as being one of the things which the Catholic text-books "fail to state." "The manuals of geography hitherto used in our schools," says the preface of one of these geographies—and the manuals of geography are largely manuals of history—"are not only objectionable on account of their misstatements, but are still more objectionable and defective on account of what they suppress or fail to state." It is interesting to go through these books and observe what they "fail to state," and then observe some of the things to which they are able to give so much space. There is room to

state that Ireland "is noted," among many other things, "for the unwavering fidelity of its people to the Catholic Faith;" but there is not room to state that the Netherlands are noted for anything besides their "low situation, numerous canals and windmills." There is room to speak of "many Catholics" exiled to Siberia, but of nobody else; to note that the States of the Church are "at present usurped" by the King of Italy, but to say almost nothing else about the whole history of Italy. A primary object everywhere is to make these books for school children serve the purposes of theological and sectarian controversy.

How about America? Here is Sadlier's smaller geography¹ — a very popular book in the parochial schools, and, like the other books in the series, a beautiful book. It contains probably all the history of the United States that some of the younger and poorer children, who leave school early, ever get. If they do get more, I could quickly show you that they are quite likely to get what is worse. Let me read to you the section devoted to the history of the United States (Lesson xxxiii, p 22):

What can you say of the United States? — It is the most populous and powerful country in America.

By whom was this country originally inhabited? — By the Indians.

By whom were the Indians dispossessed of their lands? — By the Spanish, English and French colonists.

Who were the first explorers of great portions of our country? — Catholic missionaries.

Who discovered and explored the upper Mississippi? — Father Marquette, a Jesuit missionary.

Where, in many of the States, were the first settlements formed? — Around the humble cross that marked the site of a Catholic mission.

What political division is the United States? — A republic.

How long has it been a republic? — One hundred years.

To what nation did the thirteen original States belong? — To England.

When did they declare themselves independent? — July 4th, 1776.

Why did they declare their independence? — Because they were unjustly oppressed by England.

¹ *Sadlier's Excelsior Introduction to Geography*. Designed for Junior Classes. By a Catholic Teacher. New York: William H. Sadlier. See also O'Shea's *Comprehensive Geographies*. New York: P. O'Shea.

What is the war called which occurred at this time between the United States and England? — The war of the Revolution.

What Catholic nation very materially assisted the Americans during this war? — France.

How long did the war of the Revolution last? — About eight years.

At its close, who became the first President of the United States? — George Washington.

This is the whole lesson. This is the general account of the colonization and early history of the United States. And this is a good sample of the proportion of the role assigned to Jesuit missionaries all through these books. You have heard of the boy who once asked his father, who was forever telling of his tremendous exploits at Bull Run and Gettysburg and Cold Harbor, "Father, did anybody help you put down the rebellion?" The descendant of the New England Puritans or of other worthies, whom some of us have been in the habit of thinking as standing for something in this American enterprise, is moved to ask the Jesuit, when he reads of all his accomplishments, in these books, "Did anybody help you found the American republic?"

Under the special head of New England, in this particular geography, comes this further historical information, so admirably calculated to clear up anything left doubtful as to the genesis and significance of New England in particular:

What was the first settlement in the New England States? — A Jesuit mission on Mount Desert Island (in 1612).

By whom was this settlement destroyed? — By the English.

What people made a permanent settlement in Massachusetts in 1620? — The Pilgrim fathers.

Who were they? — English Protestants who, being persecuted by their Protestant fellow countrymen, took refuge in America.

How did they act in their new home? — They proved very intolerant, and persecuted all who dared to worship God in a manner different from that which they had established.

That is all. The important, significant thing about the founding of New England is supposed to be told — there is no room for anything more than the leading facts. Now, ladies and gentlemen, you do not need to be told, and the makers of

this book do not need to be told, that this is not history. History is not history at all save as its proportions are preserved. The Jesuit missionaries were heroic men and they are most interesting figures—we are glad that our own Mr. Parkman has written so much and so well about them. But their settlements and efforts were sporadic, and have had almost no influence upon the main currents of our American life and the development of our institutions, whose sources are here left almost unnoticed. The “Jesuit mission on Mount Desert Island” should not be mentioned in a primary text-book. It is questionable whether even Father Marquette should be mentioned in a book which has no space to tell how the present Northwest became what it is. The boy or girl who learns history from such books learns no history.

These geographies are stamped on the title-page as by a “Catholic teacher.” Many of the books are marked as belonging to a “Catholic Educational Series.” Here is the “Young Catholic’s Fifth Reader,” almost every portrait in it that of a bishop. This Third Reader, “in common with the other books of the Catholic National Series, has one chief characteristic,” says the preface, “viz., a thoroughly Catholic tone, which will be found to pervade the whole book.”¹ About that there is no doubt. From the first story, on “Bessie’s First Mass,” to the pieces on “How to be a Nun,” “Saint Bridget” and “The Saint Patrick Penny,” the “thoroughly Catholic tone” never fails. The Catholic name and atmosphere and effort are everywhere. Ladies and gentlemen, that is bad. My good Catholic friends, that is bad for you, bad for your children. It is not good for any of us to let our denominationalism be the “chief characteristic” of any of our books, much less of our children’s books. We do not want, any of us, Catholic reading-books, nor Quaker spelling-books, nor Jewish geographies, nor Baptist histories, nor Presbyterian grammars, nor High Church cook-books nor Unitarian geologies, nor Trinitarian arithmetics. I have heard a story of a little girl who belonged to a Presbyterian

¹ *The Third Reader.* Catholic National Series. By Right Rev. Richard Gilmour, D.D., Bishop of Cleveland. New York: Benziger Bros.

family, coming home from school in some distress because one of her young Jewish friends had claimed that Jesus was a Jew. "Rachel says, mother, that Jesus was a Jew." "Yes, dear, Jesus was a Jew." "But how could he be a Jew, mother? Was he not the son of God, and isn't God a Presbyterian?" I wonder sometimes, when I note the sectarian atmosphere that prevades many homes, that God isn't thought to be a Presbyterian or a Baptist much oftener than he is. And our dangers will grow much graver than they are if we extend this sort of thing into our schools and set our boys and girls to studying Episcopal histories and Catholic geographies.

My good friends, we cannot afford, any of us, to live and breathe in these provincial atmospheres. You cannot afford, my Catholic brother, to let your boy grow up feeding on such history as I have said something of here tonight and as I may say more of at some other time. Defend your religion, in heaven's name, with all the vigor you will, and you may be very sure that nothing that is true and good in it has anything to fear. But do not so far wrong yourselves, do not so wrong your children, as to permit them to grow up prejudiced and jaundiced by such teachings as these. Let us at any rate have "free trade" in knowledge, or if "protection," then not protection by a Chinese wall bristling with vulgar misrepresentations of our neighbors, and thick and thin excuses and denials of all our own family faults.

My Catholic brother, are you doing your duty as a citizen of this free republic, are you doing your duty to your children, if you let them get their history from books in which every "stronghold of bigotry and intolerance" is always an anti-Catholic place? Is it right to let them be taught that "the Holy See has been God's instrument in conferring upon Europe all the real good she enjoys?" Is it right to teach them that "to Catholics are due nearly all the valuable inventions we have?" Is it right to teach them that "the only bond of unity among Protestants is a common hostility to Catholicity?" Is it right to teach them that the English free-thinkers from whom Rousseau and Voltaire drew some of the ideas which wrought

the French Revolution were men who "denied the difference between good and evil?" Is it right to represent the Thirty Years' War as a Lutheran rebellion assisted by "the Protestants of France," saying no word of Cardinal Richelieu's hand in the matter? Is it well to harp so much on Salem witchcraft, and to say nothing of the 600 condemned in one district in France by Boguet, of the 50 who suffered at Donay, of the fact that the "witches' hammer" — one of the "inventions" not catalogued by Bishop Gilmour — was the work of two German Dominicans? Is it right to record the reported answer of the Duke of Guise to his Huguenot would-be assassin, "If your religion teaches you to assassinate me, mine obliges me to pardon you," and to fail even to mention the assassination of William the Silent by the paltry wretch, Gérard, an assassin fortified for his task by "holy communion," and applauded as the doer of a laudable and generous deed by his most Catholic Majesty of Spain, who, upon the assassin's execution, elevated his family to a place among the landed aristocracy? Is that the honest way of teaching history? Is it honest and is it right to represent William the Silent — "the only ruler in the world's history," as says an English writer, "who may fairly be compared with Washington" — as an "ambitious mover of rebellion," who was "in turn, as best suited his policy, Lutheran, Catholic and Calvinist?" Prove to us, Father Metcalf and gentlemen, that you are in earnest in your scrupulous anxiety for honest history, by sweeping out of your schools the books which swarm with things like these — the pages are all at your service — and then we shall be readier to believe that it is as historical scholars and not as Catholic partisans that you desire to correct Swinton's record of the abuses which provoked the Reformation. Meantime, it is all a mournful and farcical straining at gnats and swallowing camels.

I have too much respect for multitudes of my Catholic fellow-citizens of Boston to believe that they approve of this strong sectarian teaching in the parochial schools, or that they will long continue to approve it when they carefully consider it. It has now become their duty to consider it. It is now their

duty to ask whither they are being led, and to refuse their support and to refuse their sanction to any institutions which are nurseries of prejudice, of slander and of mischievous falsehoods. Let the reform begin among themselves. Let the thoughtful Catholic citizens of Boston read these books; let them read this history of Gazeau's; let them read this book of Bishop Gilmour's; and if they do not instantly demand more radical expurgation than any of them have ever demanded for Mr. Swinton's book, then they are not the kind of men that I believe they are, and may God have mercy on their souls.

The Catholics among us — still the vast majority — who are the warm friends of the public school, and who dislike this system which it is now sought to foist upon them, should know that these very text-books are made weapons wherewith to attack the public school. "He held that Catholic schools are scarcely less important to the progress of religion than churches," it is approvingly told of one of the bishops, in this reader, "since, if we permit our children to be educated in the public schools, their faith, if not destroyed, will be undermined; and he strove in every way to fully arouse the Catholic mind to what he considered to be the greatest danger to the progress of the Church in the United States." My Catholic brother, you should warn these men that if the public school, if free and impartial education, simple knowledge, is the greatest danger to the Church, if the Church cannot maintain itself by the simple "appeal to reason" of which Bishop Gilmour tells, cannot hold its own in a fair field, then indeed it is in a bad way.

But it may be urged that this is all nobody's business. The Catholic priest may say that he has nothing to say about any books used in any Protestant private school, and that people have a right to do what they please in their own affairs. My good friend, that argument is quite out of date. You are a hundred years behind the times when you say that. You shall go to school to my friend's five-years-old boy, if you have not got beyond that. "Let Jack alone," Will said to Dick, who was quarreling with Jack about his sled; "the sled is his, and he has a right to do whatever he will with his own." "No,

sir," retorted Dick, firmly, "he has not a right to do whatever he will with his own; he only has a right to do what is right with his own." It is not our policy in this republic to foolishly or hastily or oppressively meddle with any society or with any man. There will never be any interference with any man who, for religious reasons or any other, chooses to educate his children elsewhere than in the public schools, so long as that education is done in any just, proper and respectable way. But our people do not recognize the right of anybody to do whatever he pleases with his own. The interests of the State are paramount to the caprice of any man or any body of men; the whole community is under sacred obligations to each child born into it, and every one of us is on his good behavior. There is no society among us whose affairs are or can be simply its own affairs; and if rank abuses or the teaching of palpable and baneful untruths become common and regular in any private school in Boston, whether on Moon Street or Chestnut Street or Marlborough Street, then it is inevitable that sooner or later there shall be such State supervision as shall stop it.

With reference to the present stress, men ask, and women, What shall we do? Well, I should say, in the first place, that anything that anybody "does" in a fever is not worth the doing. Let fever on the school question, I should say, stop in Boston, and stop now. There is no crack of doom in hearing. The public schools of Boston are in no danger if every man on the School Board is a Roman Catholic next year and the year after. Their interests are endangered if injustice is done, in their management, to any man or to any church. And injustice would be done if all should be insisted on which, by a strict construction, may be due. Men talk of making the reinstatement of Swinton's book in the schools a test in this conflict. They would know, were they good generals, that, whoever is to blame for it, that position is lost. I do not want to see it regained on the present basis of intelligence or in the spirit in which alone it would be regained. And, if you are Protestants, and if you choose to look upon this as a campaign, then remember that you belong to the town of Sam Adams, and that the

motto of that prince of tacticians was, "Always keep the enemy in the wrong." Your cause will never suffer from your generosity; it may suffer much from envy, hatred or malice or any uncharitableness. Insist on nothing that the great majority do not concede to be fair, and keep on telling the truth as fast as you are quite sure you know what the truth is.

Upon you, the women of Boston, there has suddenly come a very great and a remarkable responsibility. You are suddenly called upon to exercise political power under the most trying of conditions, when politics is mixed with religious animosities and the most violent appeals are made to prejudice and passion. The enemies of woman suffrage will be quick to point to every extravagance and indiscretion on your part, in the brave performance of a trying duty, as an impeachment of your cause as women. That cause can only be advanced by this experience, whatever the vote may be this year or next. It is not the less important that the coming vote be sober and intelligent, uninfluenced by the violent partisanship of either Protestant parson or Catholic priest. I do not say this to the women of this league — I sincerely wish that the voting of the men of Boston would be as just and careful as yours is sure to be — but I say it to the hundreds of women whom it is in your power to reach.

As concerns our School Board, I sincerely wish that sectarianism might never again be recognized in connection with it. I wish that no man might ever again submit a petition to it in his capacity as member of any Evangelical Alliance, but only in his capacity as a citizen of Boston. I wish that none of us might speak of any church having a "fair share" of representation on the Board. No church, Catholic or Presbyterian or Unitarian, is entitled to any "share" of the School Board, or to be thought of in connection with the School Board. The School Board is not an ecclesiastical tribunal; it is not, as it has sometimes become in some cities in our country, a way station for ward politicians on their way to the Common Council; it is the body charged with the education of the children of Boston. The direction of the public schools of Boston is a

work as momentous as the direction of Harvard University. More money is concerned, the interests are as high. The School Board of the City of Boston should be a body as dignified, as responsible and as well trained as the overseers of Harvard University, composed of those men among us who are actuated by the loftiest public spirit and who know most about education. The history of Boston has been such — this is no reflection upon anybody, I do not state it as anything that any cultivated Catholic can resent, there are cities where it would not be true — that the proportion today of our better educated men who are Catholics is but small. Leaving out the question of sectarianism therefore, which always should be left out, I should expect that the large majority of the Boston School Board today would not be Catholics. Such a condition would be only proper. Yet Boston has very many Roman Catholics as worthy as any of her citizens of place on the School Board. No vote should ever be withheld from any because he is a Catholic. But let us hear no more about any church being entitled to a “fair share” of representation.

I have endeavored, ladies and gentlemen, to give you the most serious word which it is in my power to give on this exciting and important question. I have spoken more severely upon some points than it is my wont to speak; but there are matters upon which “plain truth is all the kindness that will last.” I am less anxious to help any side in this immediate controversy than to improve the occasion to direct more careful attention to facts which will remain to affect tomorrow’s controversy also. I cannot doubt that out of all this commotion will come increased devotion on the part of every good citizen to the great interests of the public school. Despite all criticism and all grounds for criticism, our public schools are doubtless better today than they ever were before. Let us resolve, every one of us, to make them better still.

I wish for one that we might see a decadence of private schools altogether. No one could speak more warmly than I of many of the private schools of Boston and of other cities, and the private school doubtless has a certain proper place, but

I do not wish to see the system grow. I have little more affection for the Protestant private school than for the Catholic. The private school tends to create and encourage class distinctions, it draws away the personal interest of many parents, men whose interest we most need, from the public school, it does not make for sturdiness, it does not make for democracy, it does not make for public spirit. I wish that every one of you might read—it has been published, and you all can read it—the noble address of Phillips Brooks at the two hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the founding of our Latin School, and let it help you realize that it is the public school and the public school alone in which and by which our boys and girls can be trained to that public spirit and that free and equal democratic feeling which are the fundamental requirements in our democratic State. And then—this is my last word—go back two thousand years and more, open Aristotle's *Politics* to his chapters upon public and private schools, upon education in relation to the State. Read those pages well, for nothing wiser has been written from that time to this, and learn from that old "heathen" that no polity, no State, can long endure, that none is safe, whose children are not educated in hearty sympathy with its institutions and with its own fundamental principles. Ponder the pages of that old "heathen" well, ladies and gentlemen, for they contain the truth necessary for these times.

Patriotism in the Public Schools.

Two interesting things have happened within the memory of men now living—the election of a President of the United States and the election of a Mayor of Boston. I suppose that Massachusetts schoolmasters, like the rest of the world, have had their own opinions about these two interesting events, and that their opinions have not all been alike. I suppose that there are some here present who do not agree with a good friend of mine whom the newspapers report as saying at the Old South Meeting-house, a week ago, that the good Republicans voted the Democratic ticket in the late presidential election; and consequently they do not interpret that election as he does. There may be Republicans here present who do not think that the doctrine of forty-seven per cent ad valorem has been sustained unfailingly in Republican mass-meetings, during the last autumn, by appeals and arguments calculated to strengthen that sentiment of international relationship and obligation for which Cobden and Sumner labored, and to bring nearer that “parliament of man” and “federation of the world” for which all schoolmasters are supposed to foster enthusiasm; and such Republicans do not interpret their late victory as others do, nor wish to have it so interpreted.

The truth is that the Democratic party does not yet entirely monopolize American morality, and that wisdom will not perish from Washington when Mr. Cleveland and Mr. Bayard give place to Mr. Harrison and Mr. Sherman; and also that in the Republican party, which was not born on any tariff issue and can never be successfully or properly identified with any, there are men of every shade of opinion upon percentages and upon

protection and free trade. The result of the national election — I ask you, at least, whatever your varying sympathies, to consider this view with reference to what I have to say — cannot properly be interpreted as the national verdict on any particular doctrine. It was the expression of a general feeling in the country that there must be a little sharper national housekeeping, that our fences need to be put in better repair, that several things were at loose ends. The protection arguments, some of them perhaps good, many of them, to my thinking, bad, did certainly appeal to this conservative and national feeling. But this was very far from the whole of it. The feeling that there was bad housekeeping in many sections of the South, amounting often to utter disregard of law, of the rights of suffrage, and of those principles of political equality for which the war, at cost so great, was fought, was quite as strong a feeling. Affairs of recent date in Chicago, in New York, and in others of our large cities had begotten an apprehension of danger to the country from poorly regulated immigration and the too easy voting of men not yet fairly at home with us or fairly versed in our institutions. Corruptions in municipal politics, easiest of political corruptions, were rife. A wholesome sentiment was aroused everywhere against the saloon, and especially against the saloon in politics. Boston was not the only city which had a school question; and that is a question which, when it comes up anywhere, is a burning question.

And rightly or wrongly, with greater or less degrees of justice, these sundry dangerous and disintegrating elements in our public life were identified in the public mind with the Democratic party, while to the same general thought the Republican party appeared as the more conservative, more centralizing, more watchful, and perhaps more national organization. The public mind when it acts does not make nice distinctions. It does injustice often to the individual. It asks, consciously or unconsciously, one great general question. I believe its answer is always to be interpreted in a great and worthy way, and never adequately in a whimsical or passionate or selfish way, however much of passion enters in. Its answer to the question which

it put itself in the last election meant, to my thinking, that we needed a little better housekeeping, a little warmer patriotism, a little more Americanism, if one may now safely use a word which in these weeks has been so misused.

A better housekeeping and a more serious Americanism — that, I say, is what it meant; that, at least, I ask you now to consider it, without implying in the least, as you consider it, that Democratic patriots are not just as patriotic as Republican patriots. And the remarkable agitation here in Boston during these last weeks over the school question, culminating in the remarkable vote of last Tuesday, meant the same thing. Let not the lessons of that agitation and that vote be misconstrued. Let no honest Roman Catholic citizen of Boston think for a moment that it means a purpose or desire on the part of those who really stand for thought in Boston to do any injustice or permit any injustice to him or to his religion. Let him be sure that the great body of our really thoughtful men and women have no sympathy with the attempt which has been made by some of our hot Protestant ecclesiastics to turn this controversy over the school question into a general campaign against his church, with the old motto, "Anything is fair in war."

Let it be frankly said in this company, where there are surely more Protestant than Catholic affiliations, that many of these Protestant proceedings, though happily not so many in the later days when a better public sentiment had time to formulate itself, have not been creditable, and that the record does not stand approved. Let it be said — and I can say it with better grace, perhaps, than others here, since I suppose I have been a sharper critic than most of the Roman Catholic Church — that so far as the ecclesiastical part of this controversy goes, the Catholic has taught the Protestant not a few lessons in Christian courtesy, in self-control, and in sobriety of argument. I should be glad if I could have read consecutively in our newspapers this autumn two Protestant sermons prompted by the school controversy so dignified and admirable in tone as two sermons by two Roman Catholic clergymen of Worcester, Mr. Conaty and Mr. Power, which I read in the last number of a Worcester Catholic news-

paper before coming to this meeting. Let all this be said, and freely said. But when all this is said, let not the main point be forgotten, nor the significance of this uprising and this emphatic vote obscured. It was an emphatic declaration by the people of Boston—and Boston here speaks for America—that there must be no sectarian meddling with the public schools, no sectarian attempt to control or to hinder the public education. It meant that no sect, no church, can safely attempt that thing if it desires to retain the confidence or the respect of the American people. It meant that any church which does attempt it will fail, and more than that, will be humiliated before the people.

Our Roman Catholic friends upon the School Board and elsewhere tell us that they have not attempted this, and that they do not propose anything of the sort. In the main I believe them. I regard the notion that the recent change of text-books by the School Board was the result of very serious premeditation or deep conspiracy among the members as unwarranted. It was certainly, to my thinking, very discreditable; but I believe that there was more of ignorance than of malice in it. I believe that the alarm here in Boston this autumn has been altogether extravagant. Our fear of Jesuits—there are just 12,000 Jesuits in the whole world, though one would sometimes think there were 100,000 in Boston—reaches ridiculous dimensions. Our fear of the Pope of Rome is ridiculous. The political power of the Pope in Italy, in France, Roman Catholic countries, has sunk almost to nothing. Ireland snaps her fingers in his face when he ventures to meddle with her politics. The Pope, says yesterday's newspaper, refuses to bless medals for distribution in Ireland, because Ireland has "gone over to the gospel according to Davitt and forsaken the gospel of Jesus Christ;" and Ireland sticks to Davitt just the same, and kindly hopes that the Pope may in good time come to a better understanding of the gospel of Christ. The power of the Pope will never revive—do not have any fear of that. The world is not moving backward into the tenth century, but forward into the twentieth. I wish that the people in this American republic

might be roused to half the consciousness of some of the real dangers that beset them, which so many of them nurse of the unreal danger from this poor old ghost of the Pope of Rome. But, rightly or wrongly, with more or less reason, they do dread the old ghost; and with more or less provocation they have thought it well to snap their fingers in his face and in the faces of everybody under suspicion of meddling or wishing to meddle with the public schools, in a very unmistakable manner. Grant that injustice may have been done to individuals — and personally I do not think that the school ticket which has been approved is an expression of nice justice. But when the great public acts, I have said, it does not make nice distinctions. It does rough justice. It asks one great general question. And its answer to the question which it put itself in Boston last Tuesday meant that there must be no appearance of evil in connection with the public schools; it meant that we needed a little better house-keeping in that respect, a little warmer patriotism, a little more Americanism.

This, then, is a good time to talk of teaching patriotism in the public schools. The fact that you have chosen that subject for consideration here today is another sign, indeed, of that revival of patriotism, of that sense of the need of a warmer and more energetic patriotism, which seems to me to be in the air, and which is now so quick to find and to seek expression. I think it is a much more serious and thoughtful patriotism than we have ever seen before in our history. There is nothing sophomoric about it, and little, save in presidential campaigns, of the defiant spread-eagleism of the old Fourth of July oration. The truth is, we are coming to maturity, to manhood, as a nation. It is our civil war, supplemented by the centennial observances of these later years, which has done the most to revolutionize our self-consciousness as a nation. "The war which established our position as a vigorous nationality," wrote Mr. Lowell twenty years ago, "has also sobered us. A nation, like a man, cannot look death in the eye for four years without some strange reflections, without arriving at some clearer consciousness of the stuff it is made of, without some great moral

change. Such a change, or the beginning of it, no observant person can fail to see here. Our thought and our politics, our bearing as a people, are assuming a manlier tone. We have been compelled to see what was weak in democracy as well as what was strong. We have begun obscurely to recognize that things do not go of themselves, and that popular government is not in itself a panacea, is no better than any other form, except as the virtue and wisdom of the people make it so, and that when men undertake to do their own kingship they enter upon the dangers and responsibilities as well as the privileges of the function. Above all, it looks as if we were on the way to be persuaded that no government can be carried on by declamation."

Not by declamation any longer, but by intelligence, by thought, by science, by education. Let our patriotism be not less warm, let it not lose its tongue, but it must before all else be intelligent patriotism, must understand what it rests upon and know what it is working for. What can the public schools do about this? How can they inculcate patriotism, and how can they make patriotism intelligent? They can do it in the first place, and more efficiently than in any other way, by encouraging a proud self-consciousness of their own; by which I mean a proud school-consciousness, a proud consciousness of the public school as an institution of the State, as the great instrument of the whole people for the best education of the whole people, as having behind it the whole proud, watchful, anxious, expectant and commanding State. The great instrument, I say, for the best education. It is important in these days, especially in our great cities where wealth multiplies and class distinctions are fostered, where aristocracies begin to grow, and the rich man will keep his children from the poor man's children, and those not so rich will keep up appearances by aping the rich—it is important, I say, when private schools for rich men's children, schools good, bad, and indifferent, multiply as fast as parochial schools for Roman Catholics, that the public school should proudly claim its birthright and assert its high prerogative, letting it be known that the boy and the girl in the private school are not fortunate, but unfortunate, not to be en-

vied, but to be commiserated, as missing that which is best in education, as in political and social life — the stern, severe, bracing contact and competition with all sorts and conditions of men. The rich man wrongs the State when he withdraws his children, and with his children his warm personal interest, from the public schools; but he wrongs his children more. I wish that the hour which has just struck in Boston might be the hour for the beginning of a reformation in this matter, which should spread to every city in the land. Let it be the hour, at any rate, for the birth of a prouder, more aggressive, more patriotic, more political, more public tone and temper in the public schools, and in the heart of every man and woman concerned with their direction.

“In the twentieth century,” said Phillips Brooks, himself a Boston Latin School boy, in his noble oration at the celebration of the 250th anniversary of the founding of the Latin School, “as in those which have gone before, our school will be a city school. Its students will find that enlargement of thought and life which comes from close personal connection in the most sensitive years with the public life. Here, let me say again, is a blessing which no private school can give. The German statesman, if you talk with him, will tell you that with every evil of his great military system, which makes every citizen a soldier for some portion of his life, it yet has one redeeming good. It brings each young man of the land once in his life directly into the country’s service, lets him directly feel its touch of dignity and power, makes him proud of it as his personal commander, and so insures a more definite and vivid loyalty through all his life. More graciously, more healthfully, more Christianly, the American public school does what the barracks and the drill-room try to do. Would that its blessing might be made absolutely universal! Would that it might be so arranged that once in the life of every Boston boy, if only for three months, he might be a pupil of a public school, might see his city sitting in the teacher’s chair, might find himself, along with boys of all degrees and classes, simply recognized by her community as one of her children! It

would put an element into his character and life which he would never lose. It would insure the unity and public spirit of our citizens. It would add tenderness and pride and gratitude to the more base and sordid feelings with which her sons rejoice in their mother's wealth and strength and fame."

Will you go back with me two thousand years and more, and hear a word from Aristotle's "Politics"—hear how the great philosopher in Athens then saw as clearly as our great preacher in Boston now this importance of a public education? Only as the preacher emphasizes its importance for the child, the philosopher emphasizes its importance and its necessity for the welfare and safety of the State. "That the education of the young," says Aristotle, "is a matter which has a paramount claim upon the legislator, will not be disputed. The neglect of it in existing states is prejudicial to their polities. For the educational system must always be relative to the particular polity, as it is the character proper to each polity which is its habitual preservative, as it is in fact the original cause of its creation—for instance, a democratic character of a democracy, an oligarchical of an oligarchy, and so on; and the higher this character of the citizen, the higher is the polity, or form of government, it produces. And further, there is no faculty or art in which a certain process of education or habituation is not essential as preparatory to its exercise; and it follows as an evident consequence that the same is true of the practices of virtue. Again, as the end proposed to the State as a whole is one, it is clear that the education of all the citizens must be one and the same, and the superintendence of it a public affair rather than in private hands, as it now is, when each individual superintends his own children privately and with such private instruction as he thinks good. The training in public business should itself be public. And further, it is not right to suppose that any citizen is his own master, but rather that all belong to the State; for each individual is a member of the State, and the superintendence of any part is naturally relative to that of the whole. This is one point in which the Lacedæmonians deserve praise; they devote

a great deal of attention to the educational needs of their children, and their attention takes the form of action on the part of the State."

Do I need to tell you how to begin to teach patriotism to the Boston Latin School boy? Give to each boy, as he enters the school, this noble oration by Phillips Brooks, with the passage which I have repeated printed in letters of gold, and bid him learn that word by heart, and ponder it until he fully feels its full, deep meaning. What Phillips Brooks has done for the Boston school-boy, it is in the power of every school-master to do for the boys and girls whose education is intrusted to his hands. This, I say, is in the power of every teacher, and this is the duty of every one as the servant of the State—to make every pupil know and take to heart that in the public school he is the child of the State, and that the purpose of the public school is to make him a faithful, glad, high-minded servant of the State. Teach him to understand aright the purpose and the meaning of that institution of the State with which he himself, day by day, has such close and significant relations, and you have done the most which you can do to help him appreciate and love the State and its institutions altogether. To awaken this appreciation of institutions, to create what may be called the institutional consciousness—which is another way of saying corporate responsibility—is the way to make the thoughts public and large and sturdy, the way to make patriots. There is only one thing more important to give the growing boy than this sturdy institutional consciousness—the clear perception that no institution is strong or safe when it once permits itself to become the home or the prop of what is false, perfunctory or fading; that each is strong and secure only as it can face and entertain the living truth of the hour and the pure moral idea.

It is good that our schools are feeling so deeply today that it is their paramount duty to turn out good citizens. I do not think that it is necessary for me to say much to this company of teachers about the studies necessary for this special work of preparation for citizenship in the schools. You are all substantially agreed as to what they are. They are history and politics,

the principles of our own government. The boys must be made politicians, and they must be taught what is significant and great in our own history, with such a background of the world's history as shall make them know with how great a price their freedom and these high privileges, which impose such high duties, have been obtained.

I have been invited to speak to you, I am conscious, because some of you think so kindly of the Old South work in history and politics, with the direction of which I have been concerned. I shall not occupy your time with any words about that work, because we have printed all that we have to tell, and any who wish to learn more of that work will gladly be given our documents at the Old South Meeting-house. We do believe that that work is an important work, and we are glad to see it spreading in other cities of the country as it is spreading. I am certainly very glad if the papers which I have prepared in connection with that work are of use to teachers of history or to students of history. One principle has guided us in the Old South work: to begin at the soles of the boots; to begin and keep beginning with historic Boston, but not to stop until we have done something to make the young people realize their close relations to Old England and to what is much older than England, their obligations to all the centuries and all the world.

It is not necessary, I say, for me to speak much of methods to this company, and I do not care to speak much of methods. Methods will take care of themselves if we can get the right spirit, the right insight and the right devotion. Let us once be patriots, and that we shall teach patriotism, each in his own way, and that his best way, is sure. The message that is needed in our politics and our teaching of politics is the same which Emerson gave for our religion fifty years ago. What we need, he said, in that great Harvard address of 1838, is, "first, soul, and second, soul, and evermore, soul."

This word about religion is the best bridge to what I wish to urge in closing about our politics and our patriotism. We must take a higher view, a more religious view, of our politics, of our history, of our national life and office and destiny, if we wish

to teach patriotism with spirit and with understanding and with power. We have got to realize that this nation has a divine calling and commission. Men sometimes smile at the Chinese when they call themselves the "Celestials," God's own peculiar children, at those old Jews who loved to call themselves "the chosen people," at Dante laboring to prove by appeal to the miracles in Livy that the Roman nation was the one divinely commissioned nation. But it was a great and noble thought. The exclusiveness was not noble, but the fundamental idea of a divine calling and commission was sublime. That is what I wish we might have in this republic. I wish that we might feel that our State is Church, that God is in our history, that politics is religion, as Moses felt it, and David, and Samuel, and Isaiah. I think it would not have been safe to rebuke Prophet Isaiah or Prophet Samuel for "preaching politics." Moreover, it would not have been safe to rebuke those old Puritan ministers for it. It is a poor, pale, later time that has divorced politics and religion. Almost the whole of Jewish prophecy is politics. Their politics has become our religion. I wish that our own were that. I wish that when the American preacher or the American teacher desires to show most plainly the finger of God, he might do as Stephen did, or the author of that great eleventh chapter of the Epistle to the Hebrews, and recount the history of his people. I wish that we might know and take to heart that God is not Jove nor Jehovah, nor dead, nor localized; that Plymouth Rock and Bunker Hill and Boston Common are no more places in profane history — there is no profane history — than Goshen and Nebo and Zion; and that Increase Mather and Samuel Adams and Abraham Lincoln are sacred persons, as truly as Joshua, the son of Nun, or Josiah, king of Israel.

I wish that we might hear these names oftener in our religion, that so we might have a better politics and a deeper patriotism. We cannot afford to be chiefly antiquarians and foreigners in our religion. "Something that may be called religionism, not religion," says Gladstone, the Orthodox churchman, in his fine essay on "Greece in the Providential Order,"

"has led us, for the most part, not indeed to deny in terms that God has been and is the God and Father of the whole human race, yet to think and act as if His providential eye and care had been confined in ancient times to the narrow valley of Jerusalem, and since the advent to the Christian pale, or even to something which, enforcing some yet narrower limitation at our own arbitrary will, we see fit so to call." "If we had any vivacity of soul, and could get the old Hebrew spectacles off our nose," thunders the great radical, Carlyle, less patiently, "should we run to Judea or Houndsditch to look at the doings of the Supreme?" No, we should not. If we all had the true vivacity of soul, if all our eyes were open to the deep meaning of our history and of our present national existence, that would be enough.

"Next to the fugitives whom Moses led out of Egypt," says Lowell in his essay on New England, "the little ship-load of outcasts who landed at Plymouth two centuries and a half ago are destined to influence the future of the world. The spiritual thirst of mankind has for ages been quenched at Hebrew fountains; but the embodiment in human institutions of truths uttered by the Son of Man eighteen centuries ago was to be mainly the work of Puritan thought and Puritan self-devotion." If we can all once look at our beginning so, if we can all look in that spirit at the history which has followed and which is to follow, look in that spirit at our institutions and our nation, then there will be little need of addresses on the duty of teaching patriotism.

Has the Parochial School Proper Place in America?

THERE was published in London in 1883 — and subsequent editions have appeared, both in England and America — a work of 900 pages, entitled *A Catholic Dictionary: Containing Some Account of the Doctrine, Discipline, Rites, Ceremonies, Councils and Religious Orders of the Catholic Church*, by William E. Addis and Thomas Arnold, both fellows of the Royal University of Ireland. This Thomas Arnold is a son of the great master of Rugby. He was a distinguished scholar at Rugby and at Oxford, and is the author of various learned works on English literature, which are well known to teachers. He is the brother of Matthew Arnold, and the father of Mrs. Ward, the author of *Robert Elsmere*. He is therefore a Roman Catholic of such antecedents, such training and such connections as guarantee that this Catholic Dictionary or Encyclopædia, prepared with singular thoroughness and care, will state the doctrines and claims of the Church in terminology less offensive than some Catholic terminology to the Protestant mind, and in a manner most likely to commend the Catholic position to thoughtful and fair-minded Englishmen. The reliable and authoritative character of the book is vouched by the imprimatur of Cardinal Manning and the approbation of Cardinal Newman. In this Catholic Dictionary there is an article on *Education*, so fair, so firm, so thorough, so true to the indisputable position of the Catholic Church, that I shall ask you to keep a part of it in mind as a sort of compass, while we navigate together some rather troubled Catholic waters.

“As man is a complex being,” says this article, “and has himself various ends — e. g., as a subject of God, as a subject of Cæsar, as a mem-

Address before the National Educational Association at Nashville, July 17, 1889.

ber of a family, etc.—so the education of man must propose to itself several ends. Of these some one must be chief and paramount, and must direct the form and measure in which the other ends are to be pursued; otherwise the school would be the battle-ground of independent forces, each struggling for the mastery; and the result would be confusion. Now, since the object of education is to form man, the prime end, in subordination to which it must be conducted, must be identical with the prime end of man himself. What this is we learn from the Catechism: it is to know and serve God in this life, and to enjoy him for ever in the next. In subordination to this main end all educational processes are to be carried on. . . . How are human beings to obtain this necessary knowledge? The Catholic answer is that they must seek and receive it at the hands of the one divinely-appointed and infallible witness of the revelation by which God has made himself known to mankind—the Catholic and Roman Church. It thus appears that, in the logical order, the first and highest authority in all that regards education is the Church. With her sanction it should be commenced, and under her superintendence it should be continued; for were her intervention to be excluded at any stage, there would be danger lest those under education came to mistake one of the subordinate ends of man for his main end, to their own and others' detriment."

From the Church the writer turns to consider the claims and rights of the State in Education. Man being by nature a social being, and society being impossible without government, then political power is aboriginal, is, as St. Paul says, "from God." "Its main object," says our writer, "is to secure the permanence and temporal welfare . . . of the society itself and of each member of the society. . . . It is therefore entitled to take all measures required to enable it to fulfill its functions. Now, one of the conditions without which these functions could not be effectively discharged is a control over education. The organized power in society—in other words, the State—may reasonably require that all its citizens should early receive that mental and moral training which may dispose them to restrain anti-social passions, to obey the laws, and by industry to promote their own and the public welfare. Whatever control over the machinery of education may be necessary to secure the attainment of this end, that control the State may reasonably pretend to. Its claims only become unjust and oppressive when, ignoring the still more sacred right of the Church to secure in education the attainment of man's highest end, it compels or tempts Catholics to place their children in schools which the ecclesiastical authority has not sanctioned. The end pursued by the Church is primary; that pursued by the State is secondary. Each may justly demand that its authority be recognized; but the injury caused by disallowing the authority of the Church is more serious than in the contrary case, by how much that which affects man's eternal interest is more important than that which affects his temporal interest only."

"A third authority in education is that of the family" — and the author briefly touches the obligations of parents to educate their children in the ways of decency, of dignity and of thrift. "Catholic parents," he adds, "are, of course, bound also to see that the teaching in the schools to which they send their children has ecclesiastical sanction, and to resist all attempts to make them patronize schools without that sanction."

"It thus appears," he concludes, "that education has three principal ends — the first religious, the second political, the third domestic; but that among these the religious end takes the lead and dominates over the other two, on account of its intrinsically greater importance. And since, as explained above, we cannot walk securely in religion one step except in union with and obedience to the Church, every well-instructed Catholic understands that the Church must preside over the education of Catholics at every stage and in every branch, so far as to see that they are sufficiently instructed in their religion."

I wish to say that I like this Catholic article on Education, in this book which Cardinal Manning has stamped with his official approval. I do not believe that human beings have to seek and receive their moral and religious education from the "Catholic and Roman Church." I do not believe in any "one divinely-appointed and infallible witness" of God's revelation to men. I do not believe that union with and obedience to any Church is necessary to stepping securely in religion. I do not believe in any institution more divine in its origin and authority, more moral in its true definition and office, than the State. I do not believe in any institutional authority superior in any respect to the authority of the State and what the State creates and sanctions. But I do believe — and this is why I like this article, irrespective of its dialect and its particulars — that what concerns character is more important in this world than what concerns the prudences and the amenities, and that anything that claims to be education, in any large or worthy sense, must take account of the moral and religious nature of man. That which affects man's eternal interest, all will agree who believe in eternal interests at all, is certainly more important than that which affects his temporal interest only. Without stickling too closely here about nice definitions of religion and of politics, let us consent — I at least am quick to do it — that "education has three principal ends, the first religious, the second political;

the third domestic, and that among these the religious end takes the lead." All certainly will agree in this, that what concerns character, what concerns pure and noble living, is the principal thing. And, without here discussing how expressly the State ought to educate its children in what pertains particularly to the religious or domestic life, — without discussing, I say, to what extent the State ought to do or may properly do this, so much we may say: that if the State sustains and sanctions a system of education which, by its constitution and essential character, works detriment to the religious life or to the family life, then those who have at heart the interests of religion and the family may properly complain and demand reform. If such a situation exists, or if we think we see it, then it is our duty, no less as citizens than as lovers of our homes and as men who fear God, to declare that the State itself is not secure, that it is not true to its own true definition, while doing injury or injustice to any valid institution or any necessary, useful factor in the general life. Injustice in the State, let it be well taken to heart, is not what any sour or selfish party chooses to call injustice. The State is not concerned with the particular interests of any sect or any man. Like Gallio at Corinth, the State "cares for none of these things." The complainant against the State cannot undertake to figure as judge in its own business. The appeal is to the State itself, to public opinion, to the powers that be, — in the republic to the majority. If the majority is wrong, then the complainant must wait until it is right — else anarchy. If the cause is honest and good, the complainant can afford to wait. For there is one bar to which even the State must come — the future. Tomorrow, if there is real injustice, even the State must yield — that is the way the world is made. Only in justice, only in proportion and in harmony, does a true politics itself consist; only in these can any given State endure.

I like this Catholic article on Education for recognizing this many-sidedness of man and this necessity of harmony between the three great realms with which education chiefly has to do. I like it for its clear recognition of the fact that the authority of the State in education is superior to that of the

Family, and for the common sense with which it shows why this must be so. I have said that I like it for declaring that the prime end of education must be identical with the prime end of man himself. I also like the boldness and the honesty with which it declares that "the first and highest authority in all that regards education is the Church," "the Catholic and Roman Church." The conflict which is involved in certain phases of the parochial school question here in America and elsewhere is a conflict between the State and the Church. I like the boldness and the honesty with which our book, with Cardinal Manning's imprimatur, recognizes that this is likely to be the character of our modern conflicts concerning the schools, and with which it asserts the superior authority of the Church in all that regards education, both as against the State and against the Family. I do not like the attempt of Cardinal Manning, writing over his own name, in a recent number of one of our American magazines, to represent the conflict as one between the State and the Family. This is not bold and it is not honest; it is sly, sophisticated and *ad captandum*; and, like almost all the attempts of a mere craftiness, it overleaps itself and lands the author amidst generalities from which he would be the quickest to steal under the sufficiently tight pressure of an exigency, not necessarily a very great exigency.

Whatever be the necessary or proper adjustment of authority between the State, the Church and the Family, it is quite sure that it is in the Family that most of us are nearest home, and that what affects the Family touches most closely the sympathies of men. If the champion of the parochial school can appear as the champion of family rights and family freedom, and can manage further to throw over his adversary or the State the guise of coercion, he is certainly a good strategist, for that moment he certainly gains an advantage. Home is a powerful word to conjure with. "Home," says Cardinal Manning very truly, "is the school divinely founded for the first and deepest formation of men. . . . The society of mankind springs from the unity, authority and obedience of homes. . . . Filial duty is the root of civil obedience." "By the law of nature," he says,

“fathers and mothers have by right the guardianship of their own children.” And coming directly to the question of education, he adds, “Parents have the right to control the education of their children. They are bound to select such schools and instructors as they believe to be safest and best for their children.” “By the law of nature and of revelation parents are charged with the duty, and have also the right, to nurture and train their own offspring, to rear and to educate them, to choose the teachers, companions, schools and kind of education their children shall receive.” “No education law can prosper,” he says, “which is not in conformity with parental rights and liberty of conscience;” and these he declares to be “violated and subverted at one blow in the public-school system.” Expatiating with tender eloquence upon “the power of a home, with all its charities, chastities and sanctities, over sons and daughters, not only in childhood, but after they have entered into the perils and perplexities of life,” he applauds another writer for contending that “of this the public-school system robs the rising generation of the American people.” This assembly of American people and of public-school teachers will doubtless be surprised to learn that the public school is robbing their children of home and home life and influences, and I confess that it is a puzzle to me how the public school “withdraws the child from the control of the parent” to any greater extent than the parochial school does it; but precisely this is the Cardinal’s contention. “The State,” he says, “withdraws the child from the control of the parent, thereby making it impossible for the parent to confide the child to teachers of his own choice.” “The authority and right to educate their children” — this is the generality to which the Cardinal comes — “are by the divine and natural law, inalienably in the parent, against all civil authority.” The duty and the right of the State in education, he contends, are limited simply to children abandoned by careless or criminal parents. The theory that the children are the children of the State he declares to be “paganism,” a theory “which has no right in Christian or even natural society.” “Nature,” he says, “knows nothing of ‘school directors.’”

Now, ladies and gentlemen, this all appears to me—I wish to speak very plainly here—a poor piece of special pleading by one not making an earnest effort to reconcile great conflicting claims and establish sound and useful general principles, but laboring to weaken men's allegiance to the State and the reverence of families for the State, that so they may be unfortified, confused and weak when the claim of the Church to control education is presently advanced against these same families, whose "liberty of conscience" and "inalienable rights" are here talked about so glibly. About this claim of the Church the Cardinal here says nothing, for that claim is not popular with the American audience which he was addressing. He talks only of the Family, seeking to represent this conflict as one between the State and the Family, seeking to get a little immediate wind for the sails of his cause by a poor and false appeal to an easily excited sentiment, carrying this appeal so far as to permit himself to represent the Family as the supreme and ultimate authority in education—a position which every well-instructed Catholic and every well-instructed man knows he does not hold for a moment. This, I say, is not brave and it is not honest.

"Nature," says the Cardinal, "knows nothing of 'school directors.'" Neither does nature know anything of cardinals or popes or priests. Nature knows nothing of shirts or petticoats or knives and forks or the bath-tub. Nature knows nothing of the alphabet, the book, the library, the State or the Church. Nature knows nothing of Plato or Augustine or Angelo or Shakespeare or Gladstone. It knows nothing of gentlemen and scholars; it knows savages. It knows nothing of the family, in the sense in which Cardinal Manning speaks of the family, with its "liberty of conscience" and "inalienable rights." A great deal of grace had been superinduced upon nature, the theologian might say, civilization had made a very considerable start, before anything very presentable or impressive in the family line answered the roll-call in this world. Civilization had doubtless brought us a good way farther from "nature" when the first priest appeared; and it had made a very great advance

indeed when it ushered in the first "school director." If we ruled out of our American society everything of which "nature knows nothing," we should rule out much more than school directors or cardinals. On the whole, most of us grow inclined to celebrate the state of nature less than the means of grace; and our eyes get gradually opened to see that the home, the friend, the book, the song, the ship, the railroad, the newspaper, the prophet and the schoolmaster are all alike true means of grace, all revealers and arms of the infinite God, all workers together with him in the long transformation of mankind from the rude, crude state of nature into the Divine Commonwealth.

In truth, Cardinal Manning believes no more in the state of nature than does the United States Commissioner of Education. When he resorts to such an argument against the public schools as this, that "nature knows nothing of school directors," he resorts, it seems to me, to clap-trap. He resorts to convenient generalities about the Family, in his conflict with the State, which he would instantly trim and repudiate in asserting against the Family the claims of the Church. As I ask you, Catholic and Protestant alike, to admire with me the honesty and bravery of our *Catholic Dictionary*, so I ask you alike to condemn with me the clap-trap of the Cardinal.

Cardinal Manning, I have said, resorts to generalities about the Family, which, consistently and thoroughly applied, are far more fatal to the parochial school and the methods by which it is now sought to establish it in America than they can possibly be shown to be to any system of public education which exists on earth. The control of education, he says, is, by natural and divine law, the inalienable right of the Family. It is for parents to choose such schools for their children as they believe best. Interference with this parental freedom and authority is interference with liberty of conscience. The sin of the State, in maintaining a system of public schools, is in this interference with family choice.

I propose to show that all this talk about coercion and injustice on the part of the State in maintaining public schools, of which we have heard a great deal too much, although happily

not so much, I think, in these latest days as a dozen years ago, is just as valid, and no more so, as talk against the principle of taxation itself; and I shall show that this interference with liberty of conscience and family choice, with which Cardinal Manning charges the State, but of which the State is not in the least guilty, is in truth the capital sin of the Roman Church, pervading its whole policy in the establishment of parochial schools in this country, from New England to New Mexico.

The argument against maintaining public schools with public money, when perhaps this man has no children to send to school and this other chooses to send his children to a private school, is a very paltry argument. It is the same kind of talk as that of the man who is ruffled at having to pay his tax for the new city hall or the public park or the public library, which the majority has decreed, but which he doesn't want. Is not the library for education, and is not education the office of the Family and of the Church? May the State spend public dollars for what does not relate to "temporal welfare," to the quartermaster's department of life? Let it at least not buy sermons and poems for its library, only cook-books and guide-books and Cushing's Manual. Let it not build the art museum, for each family may buy its chromo and its photograph of the Madonna in the Vanderbilt mansion. Let it not send out the scientific expedition, with perchance some student from the school of mines, who will neglect to submit his proof-sheets to Moses. This thing is public education, for which divine or natural law cannot be quoted.

If the city voted that no citizen should take books from any library but the public library, that would be coercion, that would be interference with the inalienable rights of the citizen. And if the Christian Association or the Masonic Lodge around the corner, pronouncing the public library an illegitimate and demoralizing institution, dangerous to Masonry or to young Christians, voted that no member should take books from any library but that provided by itself, none, under pain of expulsion, from the public library, that would be interference with the inalienable rights of the individual; that also would be coercion,

and sooner or later, if serious collision arose, the State — which, because it is the whole people, while the Lodge, the Association, the Church, is but a part of the same, is and must be the final efficient appeal — sooner or later the State would surely stop it. It would be likely to stop it the sooner if these same Masons, for instance, demanded that the cost of their separate and anti-social institution should be remitted from their taxes, weakening the public institution to that extent, and if this offensive general policy of the Lodge was a policy unpopular even with the mass of its own members, forced upon them by their superiors — I say it would stop it the sooner under these circumstances, for these circumstances consolidate that public opinion which is the strong sanction of law. The State would not stop the Mason from reading at his Lodge, it would not lock up the Lodge's library, although it surely would do that sooner or later if that alone would stop the Lodge's contumely. The Lodge might resist, the Master might remind the Mayor, the Grand Master might remind the Governor, the Great Grand Master might remind the President, that Masonry was an international affair; but that threat would have no potency until backed up by a contingent of Hessians. Should the Hessian Masons come in sufficient force, with Russians enough and with enough Frenchmen, Turks, and Prussians, then the Lodge's library would undoubtedly be opened. But when that happened, something else would happen. There would then be no State at all, and with no State no order at all. That state of nature of which we have heard something would loom up so near as to put an ominous silence for a time to discussions of any distinctions so fine as even that between Mayors and Masons. The comfortable conditions under which men in conventions or at dinners compare their notions of the proper gradation of authorities come to a very uncomfortable and summary end when once the authority of the State is destroyed. The authority of the State is the ground and the reënforcement of all other legitimate authority, because the State is the all-comprehensive institution. Every man belongs to the State of necessity, is a citizen by virtue of

being alive. This citizen or that belongs to this Church or that if he will, or he belongs to no Church. The Church of an age, often indeed some individual in the age, may see a truer truth, may stand for a better system, than that embodied in the existing State. The fact that this is so, indeed, is the very condition of progress. Every Church and every reformer is at liberty to convert every citizen, but no citizen may be baptized by force, like the old Saxons. The appeal of the apostle of better things is to history and the future; his legitimate engine for transforming the State is public opinion. For above every State is the eternal right, is fundamental justice, against which, if a State be warring, be it ever so unwittingly, it must finally succumb, though the champion of the right be but a single soul. But while order reigns the State is the ultimate institutional authority and necessarily so. The attempt to transform the State by violence or threats, instead of by the appeal to public opinion, is incipient revolution. The subversion of the State is anarchy; and with anarchy the occasion of discussions like the present ceases.

I have somewhat outrun myself in thus attempting to lay down a few general principles and show you where certain courses logically and necessarily end; and I return to show you that the policy of the Roman Church in establishing parochial schools is characterized throughout by precisely that spirit of compulsion and coercion, so far as "family choice" is concerned, by precisely that disregard of "liberty of conscience," with which, and not alone at the mouth of Cardinal Manning, it has so groundlessly charged the State. But I wish these general principles to be kept clearly in mind as we return to this examination.

Do not think Cardinal Manning's representation of the family as the supreme authority in education to be a representation in any way peculiar to himself. It is a representation often made in these days. It was made by Father Conaty of Worcester, perhaps the ablest parish priest in Massachusetts, at the dedication of a parochial school in the suburbs of Boston last July. "By all laws, human and divine, educa-

tion belongs to parents," argues the late Bishop Baltes of Alton in one of his pastorals, as summarized by a Catholic authority—his aim being, like that of a score of bishops whom I might quote to the same effect, to show that for the State to attempt to control the Family in the field of education is tyranny. This recognition of the Family as the supreme authority in education characterized the whole Roman Catholic argument at the recent hearing before the Massachusetts legislature, which has attracted so much attention and was so representative a discussion that I shall make considerable reference to it here. The act which was under discussion, as many will remember, was an act relating to the conduct and inspection of private schools, and one of its sections provided for the punishment of "any person or persons"—I quote the act—"who shall influence or attempt to influence any parent or other person having under his or her care or control any child between the ages of eight and fourteen years, to take such child out of, or to hinder or prevent such child from attending, such public or approved schools, by any threats of social, moral, political, religious or ecclesiastical disability." A constant effort of the Roman Catholic party in this hearing was to represent itself as the champion of family freedom, and to show that from the Catholic side this freedom was not endangered. By one the bill was expressly denounced as aiming at the family. "Legislation which aims at the family," he said, "is wicked. Individuals and parents have the first right as factors in society." One of the priests who was present as a witness similarly complained of the bill as cutting off parents from the exercise of their rightful alternative in educating their children. "The parent owns the child direct from God." Father Bodfish declared the act to be "useless and unnecessary," a specimen of the kind of legislation that simply irritates, by talking—such was his implication—of evils which do not exist. This witness and that were introduced to declare that if a Catholic person wanted to send his children to the public school, the priest "had no right to forbid it;" that no threats of excommunication for attending public schools were ever heard of in Lowell; that if a parent

desired to send his child to the public school and the pastor desired him to be sent to the parochial school, "this is a free country." "If a priest tried to exercise further authority," said one, "I would not obey." "I don't care whether I am threatened or not," said another; "I shall send my children to whatever school I choose." "I never heard of a priest who refused the sacrament to the parent for refusing to send his child to the parochial school," said another. "Catholics know what their religion is," said the legal gentleman in his closing speech, "and they know that they have the liberty to send their children to any school they wish."

And yet, ladies and gentlemen, nothing of this kind is the truth. This Roman Catholic talk about parental authority and family freedom in the choice of schools is all pure fiction. If strict definition is what we are concerned with, and that I take it is what we want here, the sole "liberty" which the Roman Catholic parent has, when the command of the Church comes to him to send his children to the parochial school — and the command is issued that every parish shall have its school and that every child of Catholic parents shall leave the public school for it as soon as it is efficiently organized — is the liberty to "get out" if he chooses to disobey the command. I use the phrase of one of the more jaunty Catholic witnesses at the recent Boston hearing. "If a man joins the Catholic Church," he said, "he is bound by the rules, but is not obliged to remain in the Church any longer than he chooses." "Do you believe the parent should exercise his conscience apart from the priest?" was asked him. "Yes, sir." "Whether or not the conscience of the parent interferes with that of the priest?" "It cannot interfere with that of the priest, for parents will not remain in the Church if they do not follow the guidance of the priest. . . . The Catholic Church doctrine," he continued, "is a doctrine of authority. If the Church makes a rule to refuse the sacraments to a parent who will not withdraw his children from the public school, the law could be enforced. . . . The law of the Church is to obey or get out."

Do you know what it means, ladies and gentlemen, for a simple Roman Catholic to "get out" of the Church? From his infancy up he has declared every time that he has repeated his catechism, "All are bound to belong to the Church, and he who knows the Church to be the true Church and remains out of it cannot be saved." You will find that declaration in the eleventh lesson of the common Catechism, as enjoined by the Third Plenary Council of Baltimore. In other popular expositions of the faith the doctrine is stated in sharper terms. In a little work entitled *Familiar Explanation of Christian Doctrine*, adapted expressly for Catholic schools and published with high approbation, you will read (p. 88) that all the Fathers of the Church, "without exception," pronounce those who die out of the Church "infallibly lost for ever." "Since the Roman Catholic Church alone is the true Church of Jesus Christ," it is here said, "can any one who dies outside of the Church be saved? He cannot." Now, in respect of fine workmanship, these statements are those of cobblers. The theologian has several qualifications and comfortable explanations ready. Cardinal Gibbons and Bishop Keane, for instance, would not unqualifiedly tell you or me, who stand outside the Catholic Church, that if we die as we are, we are "infallibly lost for ever." That, they would say, depends. But in the high-ways and by-ways it is not the custom to draw fine lines; and even the theologians would indorse the Catechism to this extent, that "he who knows the Church to be the true Church and remains out of it cannot be saved." And the simple Catholic that we are talking about, to whose door comes the problem of the parochial school, does believe the Church to be the true Church. He may be learned enough to know, what the theologians could tell him is Catholic orthodoxy, that excommunication, if he is really true to his conscience, does not, in the ultimate sense intended by the Catechism, place him really "out of" the Church. He may also not be learned enough to know this. He realizes the serious danger, in any event, of cutting himself off from the regular channels of grace; and he is sure to have such notions of the gravity of defying the Church as to fill his mind with forebod-

ings of portentous purgatorial periods whenever he ventures to entertain the thought of defiance.

What kind of "liberty," I ask, has such a man, to whom the mandate of the Church is brought that he shall withdraw his children from the public school and send them to the parochial school, on pain of having the sacrament and absolution denied him? What does all this fine talk about parental authority and family freedom in education amount to, under such a condition as this? And precisely this is the condition of the American Catholic world today. If the condition does not exist here or there *de facto*, it is simply because the Church, for purely prudential reasons, does not deem it wise here or there at this moment to assume an attitude towards the Family which it claims as its right everywhere and always, and which it may assume at any moment anywhere. To the well-instructed Catholic it is not necessary to support this statement by proof. But this audience is largely a Protestant audience, and for many such substantiation may be instructive and essential. I shall quote from the pastorals of various American bishops; and first from Bishop Gilmour of Cleveland, who has been such a leader in the parochial school movement.

In his Lenten Pastoral of 1873, which was chiefly devoted to this subject and which raised very much of a storm at the time, Bishop Gilmour said :

"It is our most solemn injunction and most positive command, that every church in the diocese have its school. Where a congregation cannot at once build both church and school, let them build the school-house and wait for the church. . . . We solemnly charge and most positively require every Catholic in the diocese to support and send his children to a Catholic school, where good Catholic schools exist and where it can be honestly said a child will get a fair, common-school education. If parents, either through contempt for the priest or disregard for the laws of the Church or for trifling and insufficient reasons, refuse to send their children to a Catholic school, then, in such cases, but in such cases only, we authorize confessors to refuse the Sacraments to such parents." Parents who for social reasons chose to keep their children in public schools, mixing with Protestant children, were expressly pronounced "unworthy of the Sacraments" and told that they "need not wonder if they will be denied them." The late Archbishop Purcell declared, "We see not how they who willfully and deliber-

ately neglect this duty of sending the children under their care to a Catholic school, when in their power, can worthily approach or be conscientiously admitted to the Sacrament." Bishop McCloskey of Louisville, in 1879, prohibited the admission to Confirmation and the Eucharist of children who had not passed at least two years in a Catholic school; and on January 3, 1880, he issued a decree in which are these words: "Now it is our will and command that where there is a Catholic school in the parish, parents and guardians in such places should send their children or wards, who are under nine years of age, to such Catholic schools; and we hereby direct that this obligation be enforced under the pain of refusal of absolution in the Sacrament of Penance." The late Bishop St. Palais of Vincennes, in his Lenten Pastoral of 1872, instructed the pastors in his diocese to "refuse absolution to parents who, having the facilities and means of educating their children in a Christian manner, do, from worldly motives, expose them to the danger of losing their faith" — meaning by sending them to the public schools. Bishop St. Palais's successor, Bishop Chatard, said to his people in 1879: "The atmosphere of the public schools is not one congenial to the Catholic faith. . . . Were you, without very grave and weighty reasons, to send your children to these schools, you would sin grievously against charity to your children, and therefore would not be in a condition to receive the Sacraments, and your confessor could not absolve you." The twelfth statute of the diocese of St. Joseph's, Missouri, declares "that the Sacraments are to be refused to Catholics unworthy the name, who in the education of their children, caring nothing for Catholic schools, patronize the secular schools." "In the late case of Rev. Fr. Scully, at Cambridgeport, in the suburbs of Boston, who dared follow the teachings of the Church" — I am quoting a Catholic account — "and refuse absolution to parents rebelling against their pastor in the matter of sending children to certain public schools, when a committee waited on Most Rev. Archbishop Williams, the pastor was sustained in his action and the rebels were let to understand that their Bishop considered himself insulted by the bare suspicion that they would find any support from him as favorable to public schools." Soon after the Cambridgeport commotion the Archbishop issued a pastoral address on the general subject, in which, while cautioning moderation and the reference to himself of cases where decided differences of opinion arose between pastor and parent, he nevertheless distinctly authorized every priest to give or withhold absolution at his own discretion in disciplining his flock in this matter as in all others. This was in 1879, and this remains the status in Massachusetts today. The same is true of the diocese of Buffalo. In his special Pastoral on Education, issued in September, 1882, Bishop Ryan said: "If there be any among our people who, having suitable Catholic schools within easy reach, refuse to send their children to them, we hesitate not to say that they should not and cannot be admitted to the Sacraments."

I have here quoted only passages — they could easily be multiplied — in which the condemnation of the public schools by bishops is accompanied by distinct threats of ecclesiastical disability to parents continuing to send their children to them. If I added passages in which, while not accompanied expressly by this threat of disability, the denunciation of the public schools as Godless and wicked is made in such terms as are equally drastic to the ordinary Catholic mind, I might prolong the list almost endlessly.

I might quote Archbishop Elder of Cincinnati :

“Where Catholic schools can be established, it is sin to send Catholic children to other schools;” the late Bishop Toebe of Covington, “The public schools are infidel and Godless, and must therefore be avoided;” Bishop Janssens of Natchez, “The public school system should be looked upon by every Christian not only as insufficient, but as positively dangerous;” the late Bishop Rosecrans, “He who pertinaciously holds the doctrine that Godless schools” — that is the common complimentary Catholic term for the public schools — “are good enough for Catholic children ceases to be a Catholic, as thoroughly as if he denied the Real Presence or the Divinity of Jesus Christ;” Bishop McQuaid of Rochester, “The Bishop who fails to teach and enforce with pastoral zeal and vigilance the Church’s law of Catholic schools for Catholic children, sins; the pastor of a flock who neglects, being able, to provide such a school, sins; the members of a parish who refuse to coöperate according to their means in the establishment of a Catholic school for their children, sin.”

It is from no one quarter that these utterances come. They are inspired by no peculiar circumstances. The legal gentleman who conducted the Catholic case at the recent hearing in Boston objected, when the declaration of the late Archbishop Perché of New Orleans was quoted, “Our public-school system, as organized in this State, is emphatically a social plague,” that this declaration was inspired by the defective organization of the public-school system in the Southwest and must not be treated as representative of Catholic sentiment in New England and elsewhere, where the schools are better. But it is perfectly plain that when the Archbishop goes on to speak of the system as “vicious” and “mischievous” and “nefarious,” he is speaking of the public-school system as

such, and not of any poor schools in Louisiana in 1872; and the passages which I have cited here have shown you one feeling in the New England village and the Louisiana canebrake, in Boston and Buffalo and Cleveland and Milwaukee and St. Paul, and in Louisville, Natchez and New Orleans. "The doctrine of the Church is simply the same East and West on educational as on other matters," says the Catholic authority from whom I have made all these quotations, "and doubtless circumstances mostly have caused the dearth of Catholic schools farther north in the home of the Puritan."

"Bishops on Bishops," he says, "with Archbishops, with provincials, general councils, nay, the very Supreme Head of the Church, inculcate this truth in most clear and unmistakable tones. . . . Verily it would seem to be time for Catholic parents to finally understand that they cannot approach the Sacraments unless they send their children to Catholic schools where they have them; and cannot remain without sin, if they do not procure themselves the means to the end to which they are bound, viz., Catholic schools, in which to raise their children as Catholics. The line is drawn, and pastors cry to their flocks: Are you Catholics? Come over to me and send your children to Catholic schools. Are you not Catholics? Then go away about your business; we want no such black, scabby sheep to infest the flock of Christ."

This is our author's pleasant and graceful way of putting what our Boston friend meant by obeying the law of the Church or "getting out." This is the condition described by Cardinal Manning as "liberty of conscience" and the "inalienable right of the Family" to choose and control in education. This is the truly orthodox idea of the "freedom of the parent from all coercion."

The book from which I quote is *The Catholic Educator's Manual on Schools*, by Thomas J. Jenkins (John Murphy & Co., publishers, Baltimore). I shall make further use of it. If my address served for nothing else than to thoroughly advertise this book, in which the teachings, the claims, the programme, and the commands of the Church on the school question are carefully presented, not by enemies, but by a friend, by one thoroughly commended and indorsed by the highest Church authorities, if my address could lead every American teacher

and parent and citizen whom it may reach to invest thirty cents in this little book and learn at first hand precisely what this parochial school question is, I should feel that it was a very great service.

"These pages," says the author in his preface, "contain the conciliar or single rulings of no less than 380 of the high and highest Church dignitaries. There are brought forward 21 Plenary and Provincial Councils; 6 Diocesan Synods; 2 Roman Pontiffs; 2 Sacred Congregations of some 20 Cardinals and Pontifical Orders; 7 single Cardinals—who with 33 Archbishops make 40 Primates and Metropolitans; finally, nearly 80 single Bishops and Archbishops deceased or living in the United States. All documents and rulings are from the last half-century."

The book, I have said, has the highest official indorsement. It bears the imprimatur of Cardinal Gibbons, who pronounces it "an excellent repertory for those who wish to supply themselves with ready materials for treating the subject of Christian education," and offers the author his "congratulations on the manner in which he has handled this vital question." Cardinal Newman writes from England—his letter, in fac-simile, is printed immediately after the title-page—to pronounce the volume "as seasonable and important in England as it can be in America." Bishop Janssens praises the author's mingling of "sound reason with gentleness of expression," as more apt to "convince the American mind" than certain more violent Catholic writing on the subject. Monsignor Preston writes that "being a compilation of unquestionable authorities, it must do much good." The commendations of numerous bishops, including Bishop Keane and Bishop Spalding, are cited; and the newspaper notices wind up the long procession of praise. "It is the best work on the subject," says one. "In it," says another, "the voice of the Church on Christian education is made to speak." Another praises it for bringing to the front "what is after all the most cogent of all arguments for the Catholic, the judgment of those who have been divinely made 'bishops to rule the Church of God.'"

I marshal to this unusual extent the credentials of this little book from which I quote so freely, because I wish all to

clearly understand that I am not here repeating things which enemies of the Catholic Church have raked together to make capital against the Church, but authoritative utterances carefully gathered with the warm approval of the highest dignitaries of the Church for the purpose of adequately impressing upon the people the sinfulness of attending the public schools and the duty of withdrawing from them. "We are sure," says another of the newspaper notices, "that nobody who peruses this little work can have any doubt but that the Episcopate of the Catholic Church is unanimous in condemning the Godless system of education." And the author himself, at the beginning of one of his chapters, remarks, "Non-Catholics, perhaps, are astonished that our bishops are so bold in denouncing the public State schools. It might be answered them that they have yet to learn what a bishop is."

And yet this is not a matter of individual bishops. As Bishop McQuaid of Rochester says frankly, "It is not left with bishops to choose in this matter. They receive commands from an authority higher than their own." The author of our little manual, where he speaks of Archbishop Williams's support, followed presently by his still more pronounced support of the policy of Father Scully in refusing absolution to the parents at Cambridgeport who refused to withdraw their children from the public school, says: "Though it was thought by the more conservative that the time had hardly arrived for anything like a general reversal of former toleration of even the best common schools for Catholic uses, it was not long until there were discovered many more practical supporters of the change than was at all suspicioned — thanks, perhaps, to certain Roman hints."

Roman hints! The policy of the Church as to American schools, let it be remembered, as well as to other things, is determined at Rome, and the bishops here have simply to fall into line. As Bishop McQuaid says, "It is not left with them to choose." What are the most important "Roman hints" as concerns the relations of Catholics to our public-school system? The most important "hint" of all, as is known to most of you, was the Instruction of the Sacred Congregation to the Bishops

of the United States, on the Public Schools, approved and confirmed by Pius IX, November 24, 1875. This famous document pronounced our school system "a most pernicious system," and declared that "the most honored prelates must use every possible endeavor and means to protect the flock committed to them from all contact with the public schools." It explained the conditions under which, pending the provision of parochial schools, the clergy might permit their people to continue their children in the public schools, and concluded as follows :

"Whoever, having in their locality a good Catholic school, fitly appointed to teach their children, or, having the opportunity of educating their offspring in another place, nevertheless send them to public schools, without sufficient reasons and without the necessary precautions by which the proximate danger of perversion may be made remote — all these, it is evident from Catholic moral teaching, if they are contumacious, cannot be absolved in the Sacrament of the Penance."

This question of the proximate and remote danger of perversion is a rather interesting one, upon which something may profitably be said. But without delaying to say anything here, I would remark that to this very plain "hint" of Pius IX is to be added the declaration of the present Pope, in 1884, that the Church "has always openly condemned schools called mixed or unsectarian, and admonished heads of families again and yet again carefully to avoid them." This declaration was in an encyclical letter to the French bishops. The Pope had previously addressed the Italian clergy to similar effect, protesting against the removal of the Catholic Catechism from the public schools of Rome. "Not content with these plain, strong instructions to the Italian and French clergy and people," says the author of our valuable little repertory, "the wise and benevolent Pontiff has turned his gaze directly upon the English-speaking Catholic world, and opening his infallible mouth, deigned to teach even the minutiae of the duties of all, in his short, comprehensive Letter to Cardinal Manning and the English Bishops. The America-loving Prince has mailed to our Catholic papers in the United States a certified translation of this document."

Even before this, in the same year, 1885, the Pope had revised the decrees of the Third Plenary Council of Baltimore, which embodied the following, which remains the authoritative general word of the Church in America concerning the schools: "We exhort and command our faithful people . . . to regard the parochial school as an essential adjunct of the parish. . . . The school is nowise a matter of choice with the priest. . . . It is a duty and burden imposed by the Church." The decree proceeds to condemn as something to be "uprooted from the minds of the laity," "with zeal and prudence," "the erroneous opinion that the solicitude for the school is to be confined to that portion of the congregation actually and directly making use of it for their children. It must be plainly demonstrated that the profits and blessings accruing from the preservation of faith and morals in parochial schools redound to the benefit of the whole community." Let this word be noted in connection with certain current objections to the taxation of all for advantages accruing directly only to a part of the community.

I shall not quote any of the generalities from the letter of the Pope to Cardinal Manning. I shall refer simply to its report of the maintenance in Rome, "with the greatest effort and at great cost," of Catholic schools to counteract "the prevailing license of opinion and of action," which it is implied the municipal schools help to breed, and which had been the especial theme of the earlier letter to the Italian clergy; and its declaration that "in these schools"—apparently in contradistinction to the other—"the liberty of parents is respected." I make the first reference because it prompts a comparison so broad and instructive that we cannot here afford not to make it. The second reference brings us back to our point of departure.

The condemnation by the Pope of the municipal schools of Rome is simply a part of the general papal condemnation of New Italy. It is a part of the general condemnation of Victor Emmanuel and Garibaldi and Cavour, and of the whole course of Italian politics for the last thirty years. It is the voice of one who can find more to admire in the Italy of 1850, where such abuses were daily and lawful under the sun as those with

whose story Gladstone, in his letters of that year from Naples to the Earl of Aberdeen, made Europe ring, than in the Italy of 1889, which is the theme of Gladstone's article in the last number of the *Nineteenth Century*. The "America-loving Prince," to whom our Catholic bishops turn for instructions as to the education that shall make America what it ought to be, looks out upon New Italy from the windows of the Vatican, and only denounces and laments. The great Englishman, whose word also comes to us commended by a love for America which some of us believe equally warm and intelligent, looks upon New Italy, remembering the history of these thirty years, and wonders and exults. He sees that the removal from the Church of temporal power is largely what has wrought this marvelous renovation of Italy; he knows well that any social or intellectual disorder or extravagance, known to the envious ecclesiast as "license of opinion and of action," is as nothing to that license of great and petty tyrannies and monstrosities in every province of life under which Italy groaned thirty years ago without provoking any dyspepsia in the Vatican and without much disturbing anybody's sleep there; and he asks men to pray that Italy may "detect and renounce every temptation to sink back to the level of lower ideas and of narrower aims."

If this intense zeal on the part of the Roman Catholic Church for the good education of her American children be indeed zeal for education, and not chiefly zeal for Church, how does it happen that the zeal is not equally intense where the Church has things all her own way? How does it happen that this zeal for the good education of the masses in each given country is directly proportioned to the excellence of the public schools in that country? How does it happen that the chief object of anxiety is the United States of America? Are we poor above all men in reading, writing and arithmetic? Is America, on the whole, in greater danger from ignorance than South America and Spain? Is popular education here, on the whole, behind that of Italy thirty years ago?

The question of Italy, ladies and gentlemen, is the question of the world. Deep down, this whole question of parochial and

public schools is the question whether we shall admire most the Italy of 1850 or the Italy of 1889. The attempt of the Catholic Church in America today to force the children into parochial schools by threatening parents with religious disabilities is a galvanic assertion of the old ecclesiastical claim to temporal power; the last poor exhibition of the hoary old claim of the priest to empire and the sword. Against all this stands the modern State, the people, jealously respecting the rights of every religion and the sane scruples of every man within its body, keeping an open ear to every complaint and pledging itself to redress every real grievance, leaving with strict impartiality to every sect the religious training of its own children, permitting private schools, with howsoever much etiquette and tone or with prayers many and catechisms many, to any who desire them and will keep them to the standard which the State prescribes, but insisting that every child shall be well educated in those things which belong to the good education of all citizens alike, providing schools in which this education shall be given, and insisting that every child shall have the privilege of attending these schools, and that in the exercise of this common privilege no threat of disability and no intimidation of any sort whatever to any child or any parent from any source, religious or political, barbarian or Yankee, Know-Nothing or Fenian, Jesuit or Jew, shall be permitted for an hour.

No man can properly speak of this impartial attitude of the State as "compulsion" or "coercion," who is not prepared to speak so of the principle of taxation itself and of republican government altogether. The man who does it discredits his common sense and advertises himself as a bankrupt with an axe to grind. No man has done it in America, I think, whose motive has not quickly been found to be some sectarian ambition or some private greed. The objection is not possible to the mind that is public. The objection would be valid and would be imperative if the rights of the minority were not respected; for respect for the rights of the minority is the democrat's sacred duty. His more sacred duty, however, is to remember always that the minority cannot have its way. It

must help build the road, although it must not be compelled to march up and down it, if it prefers to tramp the fields and, so doing, will not meddle with the turnips. It must help build the school, but every family in it must be allowed to teach its children in its own kitchen if, so teaching them, it can only satisfy the State that it has taught them well.

Some of the truths here briefly hinted are now so obvious to the American mind that, whatever other demands may be made from any quarter and whatever collisions may yet arise in the schools, I think we shall soon hear the last of the demand—which was a very common one a dozen years ago, when the parochial schools began to multiply—that the public school money itself should be divided, or that those who chose to support private schools should have the cost of the same remitted from their taxes. Of that, I say, I do not think it likely that we shall long continue to hear. Were our answer to the question, Has the sectarian school proper place in America? an answer to the question whether the sectarian school should be supported by the public money, by the remission of taxes to any church or class, the answer would be a very short one. I have sometimes thought that the practical absurdities to which the attempt to carry out in America the system of sectarian schools supported by public money would quickly reduce us, would, if those who propose it would take one all-round look at it, be the most effectual way and a sure way to show them how utterly they have confounded the various provinces of education. The practical absurdities at once condemn the theory. The support by the State of the Catholic school is the support of the Baptist school, of the Jewish school, of the Buddhist school, the remission of taxes to the millionaire of Murray Hill or the Back Bay, to any group, religious or social, which asks support and elects to combine for a school of its own. For the State can show no favoritism; it cannot make exceptions. I am not painting any extravagant picture; I am not indulging in rhetoric; I am speaking of what every student of history and politics knows would be inevitable and quick results. The public support of any sectarian school, the exemption of

any sect or class from the school tax, means the confusion and debasement and then the destruction of the public-school system — means England before 1870. I take it that America does not desire to gravitate toward the condition of England before 1870.

Whenever, therefore, the parochial school or any school accompanies its demand for place in America by a petition for public money or remission of taxes, by any claim that is opposed to the integrity of the public school system, we may say very plainly that it has not proper place in America; it is fundamentally out of harmony with the American idea and with our genius as a nation. So much, I think, it is not necessary to argue in this National Educational Convention. But I wish to say more than that. I wish to say, returning to the reference of the present Pope to the "liberty of parents" in education, which also brings us back again to Cardinal Manning's declaration about "liberty of conscience" and the right of parents to choose for their children the schools they think best, that anything that interferes with that right of the family or that individual liberty has no proper place in America and will not be permitted in America. I have shown you conclusively that the Roman Catholic Church in America, in the carrying out of its policy of establishing parochial schools, has entered upon a systematic course of ignoring and defying those rights. I have shown you that its talk about family authority and the liberty of conscience is fictitious and fraudulent, and that the Catholic people of America today are everywhere under the extremest form of coercion — everywhere under the law, to be practically enforced here or there as any priest or bishop may decree, to withdraw their children from the public schools, under pain of such religious disabilities as they believe endanger the safety of their souls.

This thing, I say, is not proper in America, and this thing cannot be permitted in America. It is a flagrant violation of the rights of citizenship, as citizenship is conceived in this republic; and the great Roman Catholic masses, to whom this thing is hateful, to whom the parochial-school system is hateful,

who are by a vast majority today the staunch and grateful supporters of the public school, to which they and their children owe so much—the Roman Catholic citizens of America, because they are citizens of America as well as members of the Roman Catholic Church, are entitled to be freed from this coercion. I wish that every one of us might go home from this convention, resolved that upon the statute books of his State shall be written such laws against these threats of religious disabilities as shall put sharp and summary stop to any further attempt at this sort of tyranny. There can be no *imperium in imperio* in this American republic.

The Roman Catholic school, parochial or other, does properly have the same place in America, and this right must everywhere be firmly secured it, which the Episcopal school has, the Unitarian school, the Lutheran school, or any private school whatever—the right to open its doors, to make itself as attractive as it can, and to invite anybody it will. Like every other private school it must satisfy the standards of the State, but it has the same right as every other to resent all officious meddling. It has the right to be Roman Catholic, as Baptist has right to be Baptist. It has the right to criticise the public school and to say as much as it pleases of the superiority of the education which itself gives. But it must not threaten, it must not coerce. That is not proper, and that will not be permitted in America.

Strength and endurance in America depend on love of sunlight and the air. Whatever believes in itself will here keep open doors. Bishop Keane rejoiced, in a recent number of the *Catholic World*, that the new Catholic University was to be at Washington, because there public attention centres, there everything is most under the eyes of men, and thus the Church challenged and invited closest inspection of its system of higher education. Let that noble word be echoed by every parochial school. Let every visitor be welcome, let every book be on the table. I sympathize to a great extent with the Catholic Church's dislike of secret societies; it is seemly, at any rate, in this republic, that when the city hall is

built the mayor lay the corner-stone. Let the Church, then, by great boldness, if it believes in itself, do everything in its power to lay every suspicion, whatever its ground, that it is itself a secret society. Let not the parochial school, when the visitor knocks, refer him, as I read in a Milwaukee paper was recently the case in that city, "to the Archbishop."

There are two kinds of propriety. In considering here whether the denominational school has proper place in America, I have been considering whether it be permissible or properly lawful, and the conditions under which it is permissible; and I have confined myself to the Catholic parochial school because no other raises any serious problem in our society. But much that is permissible and lawful is not proper or right.

It is not proper nor right for anything in this world to support itself by false or harmful arguments or to live by the perpetuation of evils. The arguments by which the parochial-school system are being forced upon the Catholic people of America are many of them — and those main arguments — false and most harmful. Its friends are constantly betrayed into a recklessly exaggerated criticism of the public schools, which is vastly more immoral and demoralizing than any possible evils complained of. Here is the picture of the public schools given in our little book: "They everywhere banish religion from the school room and school grounds; pretend to instruct in such branches only as will sharpen the wits to make money by trafficking, and cultivate the brains at the expense of the heart — placing man's destiny in the enjoyment of food or the amenities of 'culture.' Text-books and teachers profess to impart only that which regards what is called 'secular' education alone, and how to make life comfortable by excluding eternity; excluding, therefore, everything that has reference to religious faith and religious practices. 'Let us eat, drink, and be merry — tomorrow we die,' is a fit escutcheon for every public-school door." I pronounce that — and it is not the worst passage I could quote — a gross libel upon the public school. It seems to me that the bishops who bless that are engaged in doing what is spoken of in the Old Testament as "cursing that which God

hath not cursed " — a business into which even Balaam refused to go. Cardinal Manning himself has argued that the public-school system has demoralized New England, and attempted to substantiate it by the statistics comparing crime in New England with that in the South under the old regime — statistics which have been so completely demolished by Judge Tourgée and by General Walker in his letter to Professor Fisher. In truth, whatever the relation of the facts, increase of crime in New England has been almost exactly proportioned to Roman Catholic immigration. Cardinal Manning quotes with approval the statement that the moral tone of the public schools is sinking through the gradual withdrawal from them of good and efficient teachers. It is the commonest Catholic remark that the Protestant children are the immoral and wicked in the public schools and the Catholic children the chief sufferers. An entire chapter in our little book — on the whole, perhaps, the most vicious chapter in the book — is devoted to pressing the point of "the unrestrained immorality of many Protestant and other associates of Catholic children in public schools." "Catholic children who are sent to parochial schools," it is said, "with all their religious instruction, moral training, and the surveillance exercised over them at home, at school, and at church, are often bad enough. But this, by the acknowledgment of impartial observers, is in *spite* of their training and the watchfulness of their Christian guardians; and whatever vices they may have are mainly attributable to their associations outside." Our "impartial observer," we take it, would tell us, per contra, that the small boy from the Methodist home is perverse *by reason of* the precepts of his mother or of his schoolmaster. "It is no great wonder," continues this wise man, "that non-Catholic children going to public schools are wicked, for the very simple reason that they have scarcely any opportunities of being good" — the reason being that they "have no unvarying faith to back up the general moral teaching" of their parents; and after remarking that he "will not become a scandal-monger," he proceeds to intimate that the public schools are the general nurseries of vices of every sort, including "liaisons

among teachers or pupils." And it is to this that cardinals and bishops and monsignors give their imprimatur and their benediction — men who should know perfectly well, who if they do not know have chosen to close their eyes and their ears, that the general moral tone of the schools of America is as much more elevating and inspiring than that of the schools of Spain or Cuba or Yucatan, where the Catholic supervision is supreme, as their intellectual methods are superior; and who should know well that if our boys and girls in the schools suffer ever in manners and morals from association with their fellows, it is not the manners and morals of the children from Roman Catholic homes which are generally recognized by the "impartial observer" as the finest in the general variety.

Bishop Spalding has well said that "a sophistical mind is as immoral and irreligious as a depraved heart, and that when a man persuades himself that a lie may be useful he becomes the foe of all that makes life high and God-like." "The fault-finder," he has said again, "is hateful both in life and in literature," and "a Christian, of all men, is without excuse for being fretful and sour." The public schools are the great moralizing institution in America today. This is shown by the simplest analysis of the discipline and essential methods of the schools — the training which they give in habits of punctuality, order, obedience, industry, courtesy, and respect for simple merit. There is nothing more moralizing than history well and truly taught, showing the operation of the stern laws of cause and effect in the lives of nations and of men. The appeal is to this great convention of teachers. The appeal is to the public schools of this city which we visit today — equal in every moral quality, I venture to assert, while knowing little of them in particular, to the parochial schools of any city in the land. Much in the loose indictment is slander upon the noblest men and women of America. The criticism has miserably failed. The superiority of the parochial school to the public school in any moral quality has not been shown. The talk about the public schools as "Godless," which is common in Catholic mouths, should also be severely dealt with. As

well talk of the newspaper or the shoe-shop as "Godless," because work is not begun with a prayer-meeting. It is true that work and prayer should go hand in hand, but there is a time for work and a time for prayer; and so is there a time for arithmetic and a time for catechism. There is no educational maxim, perhaps, better than "A sound mind in a sound body"; but it does not follow that the school is not competent to teach physiology without supporting a gymnasium. It is true enough that the religious education of vast numbers of children is sadly deficient; but this accuses chiefly the family and the Church and not the public school. There is nothing in the life of the school that militates against religion; there is much in the life of many families, even Roman Catholic families. Let us begin our reforms at home. The school cannot do everything. It is an evil thing to confound provinces in education; and it is a distinct harm, both to intellectual training and to religion, to mix religious exercises carelessly with ordinary school work. No science, no realm of education, is "Godless." God is the God of Winthrop and Washington and Lincoln as truly as of Abraham and Isaac and Jacob, the God of geometry as well as of the calendar of the saints. "The brighter the torch of science," said Bishop Ireland, dedicating the new cathedral at Providence the other day, "the clearer is the pathway to God's throne. Wherever science penetrates, with geologist's hammer, with astronomer's telescope, with biologist's microscope, everywhere there is order and harmony and beauty." Then is it impious to call the public schools "Godless." "Stupidity is more to be dreaded than malignity," said Bishop Spalding at the laying of the corner-stone of the Catholic University at Washington; "for ignorance and not malice is the most fruitful cause of human misery. Men in becoming wiser will become nobler and happier. The evils that spring from enlightenment of mind will find their remedy in greater enlightenment. Since morality is practical truth, increasing knowledge will make it at once more evident and more attractive. To be distrustful of science is to lack culture." The public school is America's Amen.

A parochial school can never give anything else than a parochial education ; it cannot make the mind public and large. The State may justly complain of it as anti-social. The public school is the great conservator of our democracy, best bringing all classes into understanding of each other. The priest complains that the Catholic boy is ridiculed at school. Doubtless he often is, and it is a wrong — we are still savages to some extent. Shall he then be fenced in, or live it down like a little man? So is the Irish boy ridiculed — “Paddy” is an epithet much oftener hurled than “Catholic” — and the Chinaman, the Negro and the Jew. Shall they then be herded by themselves? Rather it is a reason why they should stay. The Jew at the head of the class must be reckoned with ; in the Ghetto he is a starveling and a menace. The fact that so many of our Roman Catholics are still essentially “foreigners” is a reason why they above all others should be kept long in the public schools. The State cannot encourage insulation, and none of us can afford it. Parochialism fosters the narrowness and disproportion which are falsehood. The Methodist boy is being maleducated and wronged, to whom the chief thing told of Oxford in his geography is that Wesley studied there ; the Catholic, who learns of Lima only that it is noted as the birth-place of St. Rose, or in whose “English Literature” Dennis F. McCarthy — the illustration is from a common text-book — has equal space with Hawthorne, and Kildas and Bishop Doyle crowd out entirely Shelley and Keats. It is not good for the Catholic boy to read in his history — my references are all to common text-books — that “Catholicity has ever appealed to reason ; Protestantism, like Mohammedanism, to force and violence” ; to have Luther and the Reformation explained by the word, “Wicked men are always disposed to rebel against authority” ; to be told that almost all valuable inventions have been by Catholics ; to learn much in his geography of Père Marquette and the Jesuit missionaries at Mt. Desert, and little of the Pilgrim Fathers, of Winthrop, and Penn, and Capt. John Smith. Such teaching of history is not moralizing. I shall not here, however, enter in detail into the

faults of the parochial school text-books, because I have done that elsewhere. The Catholic schools are in the danger which Brownson, the best Catholic mind we have had in America, declared them to be in in his day, of keeping their pupils in the Middle Ages instead of in the Nineteenth Century. I am conscious of differing sharply in my theories of education and of Church and State from some who are present, from whom in much I would gladly learn. But no motto is so good for the scholar as that old word of Aristotle, "The truth before Plato"; and, in discussions like the present, the plainer we are and the quicker we fully understand each other the better. If I have misstated any fact, I shall quickly be corrected in this newspaper age. About Roman Catholic religion I have nothing to say. This is a political and social question. I have spoken as I would speak of the Presbyterian Synod, if it took the same position which I here condemn in the Catholic. I have before now earned dislike by the sharp words with which I have more than once defended Roman Catholics, in this school controversy, from the Protestant bigotry that sought to make religious capital out of it, and I am willing to earn more. But the Roman Catholic masses need now to be shown plainly just where they are being led; and they should be made to feel their duty, as American citizens, of reminding priests and popes that the control of "faith and morals" cannot be extended to the how their children shall get their arithmetic and history, or to any province that priests may elect.

This is a bad time to urge that the State should not educate its children, but leave that work to be attended to as it may. We are now advancing to a higher and not a lower view of the State and of its functions and duties. We all need to feel as citizens that we are as truly our brothers' keepers as the churchman used to feel himself as churchman. I find in most of the Catholic utterances on education no sense of obligation to the whole, no civic breadth, no thought of any children but their own. We should all know and take to heart that, by the very nature of the case, all are children of the State, as all are

children of families and some are children of the Church. To be educated is to be able to stand outside ourselves. No man is so uneducated or so dreary as the High Churchman whose only talk is of surplices and stoles and Sexagesima Sunday, and whose only book is Keble; or the Boston Unitarian whose only sentiment for the Baptist round the corner is a pale, supercilious pity, and to whom Henry Ware is a greater name than Maurice or Newman. The Baptist college cannot give a proper education with none but Baptist professors; no college, that fosters the notion that astronomy or political economy or Greek has anything to do with church polity or creed. We hear much in these days of a National University at Washington, and just now a Catholic University is being opened at Washington. I wish it well if it pursues a truly catholic course, as I wish well to Wesleyan University and to the Congregational college at Amherst. It is a good augury that at the head of this Catholic University is to stand the eloquent scholar whom we have heard today. There is no bishop in the Church, save Bishop Spalding alone, who seems to me so truly in harmony with what I have called the American idea. But I feel that no university at Washington under the auspices of any church can ever be such a university as that which Washington, in his last message to Congress and in his will, commended to the American people. Let us at least see to it that the public schools, the schools of the whole people, are ever kept informed by that broad public spirit which was the spirit of Washington and in any danger to which he saw our greatest danger.

Martin Luther:

A STUDY OF REFORMATION. By EDWIN D. MEAD. Cloth, 12mo, 194 pages. Price, \$1.25. For sale by all booksellers. Sent, postpaid, on receipt of price, by the publisher, GEORGE H. ELLIS, Boston.

An essay upon the significant phases of Luther's life and work, with special reference to present problems of reform; discussing the principles of Individualism and Rationalism for which Luther stood, and the Libertinism, the Old Orthodoxy and the New Orthodoxy with which he came into conflict. First published on the occasion of the Luther quadricentenary, this work is less a historical study than a tract for the times; and as such it is chiefly commended to the attention of those who are interested in the questions which now agitate our churches and general religious circles.

We recall the sensation of pleasure with which, a year or two ago, we turned from the swarm of bulky Carlyle books of high and low degree to Mr. Mead's discriminating and compact little volume on *The Philosophy of Carlyle*. With a similar sensation we welcome, among the host of books, reviews and magazine articles on Luther and his times, Mr. Mead's *Martin Luther, a Study of Reformation*. It has the same firm literary qualities as the study of Carlyle. The book exhibits that combination of conciseness of statement with breadth of view which ought to be a good deal more common than it is, since, as a rule, it is only the author who has half-mastered his subject who needs reams of paper to express himself. One cannot read the first chapter without perceiving that here is a book which is worth while.—*Boston Journal*.

Mr. Mead's monograph on Luther is a bright and panoramic view of the movement of the Reformation, written somewhat in the fashion of Carlyle's *French Revolution*, and intended to exhibit Luther as he lived, battled, thought and served. It lets in light which, if not new, has not been sufficiently used by others. What is most marked in Mr. Mead's work, and it is perhaps more manifest in this volume than in anything he has heretofore written, is a certain mental freedom, a grasp of the right conditions of his subject, an outlook upon the world from a fresh point of view. After all that has been written about Luther, Mr. Mead gives us better insight into the world in which he lived than any of the writers who have helped to celebrate his 400th birthday.—*Boston Advertiser*.

Mr. Mead's plan is to set forth the conditions of life in the sixteenth century, the state of society, the way things were looked at on both the Protestant and Catholic sides. He presumes a familiarity with the history, at least with its outlines, but goes beyond that, and seeks to revive Luther's points in theology, his quaint notions, his broad and generous humanity, the things in which, by his age and nationality, he was a different man from the American. These features distinguish Mr. Mead's work from that of other writers, and give it a zest of its own. He brings Luther nearer to ourselves than Köstlin does, or than any of the recent anniversary orators did. He does more. He interprets Luther to the modern mind and spirit. He discusses Luther for his time, but with the breadth and vigor of a thoroughly modern man.—*Boston Herald*.

The word here spoken by Mr. Mead is one much needed at the close of the debate called forth by the Luther anniversaries. These chapters tell us, what is well worth hearing, that the Roman answer to the great demonstration of enthusiasm for Luther's memory has been nothing more than a warming over of the ancient dish of absurd and monstrous calumnies which, from Luther's time until now, has been served up for the satisfying of the faithful. It is a good service to point out, as Mr. Mead has done, that what seems to many the failure of Protestantism is nothing more than the failure of certain schemes and certain combinations going under the name of Protestant; while the real thing, the spirit of Protestantism, is moving on in other forms to ever-new victories. Mr. Mead's hero-worship is far from that blind reverence which sees only good in its object. He recognizes Luther's faults and dwells upon them. Only he insists that these faults, which have been seized upon as a reproach to the great cause, had really to do with the cause only in so far as they helped to make up the mighty individuality of the man.—*The Nation*.

Those of us who remember that, when the market seemed burdened with books about Carlyle, it was the little volume by Mr. Mead that was welcomed here and in England as the word that helped most of all to clear the atmosphere, and show the rugged Scotchman in his true position, are prepared to expect help from the same pen in gaining a true conception of the word and work of the great German. This book is all one great sermon, ending, in the good old style, with an improvement suited to our present time and situation; only it must be understood that it is a sermon without a dull line.—*Chicago Tribune*.

The Philosophy of Carlyle.

By EDWIN D. MEAD. Cloth, 16mo, 140 pages. Price, \$1.00.

To those who wish a final, reliable judgment concerning Carlyle, we recommend the perusal of this book.—*Christian Register*.

Mr. Mead's book is to be commended as the most thoughtful and satisfactory account of the great man that has yet been given to the world.—*The Christian Union*.

After the vast amount of material relative to Carlyle, which has found its way into the papers and magazines during the last months, it is a pleasure and a relief to take up an essay like that of Mr. Mead, in which a sincere attempt is made to fix Carlyle's true position. Mr. Mead's view is broad enough to take in all of Carlyle's work.—*Boston Journal*.

In this revival of interest in Carlyle as a man, and especially in the thinker's gift to his race, we hope that Mr. Mead's bright and acute book on the Philosophy of Carlyle will be read widely by those who knew little or nothing of Carlyle until the gossip about him began. Students will have read the book ere this, since it was published in 1881. But many young persons are coming up now, who know nothing of the power and inspiration which an older generation gathered from the rough old Scotchman. Mr. Mead's book will be a great help as an interpreter. More than this, Mr. Mead is a harmonizer—one who sees both sides of a subject, and can show their relation. And he has given us, in his thoughtful, appreciative and just analysis of Carlyle's philosophy, the one thing lacking in that philosophy. He has given us the counterbalancing doctrine that, although the individual life is the real power and the goal of all true effort, that individual life must be developed in all humanity by democratic and coöperative measures rather than by overawing superiority in the elect few and their stern control of the many.—*Providence Journal*.

English critics call attention to the fact that the best book on Carlyle's work as a thinker and writer is this American book — *The Publishers' Weekly*.

Among the crowd of papers and treatises which the public interest awakened by the death of Carlyle has called forth, this book deserves careful mention. It bears upon every page traces of earnest thought, refined sentiment and high culture.—*The Inquirer, London*.

Mr. Mead writes as an earnest thinker, thoroughly at home in his subject; and his essay is therefore of value.—*Cambridge (England) Press*.

This work is marked by such a thorough yet discriminating admiration of Carlyle as proves that its author has clearly and firmly grasped Carlyle's method, spirit and principles. Such books as this of Mr. Mead will help in the formation of a sound public opinion.—*Edinburgh Daily Review*.

For sale by all booksellers. Sent, postpaid, on receipt of price, by the Publishers,

HOUGHTON, MIFFLIN & CO., BOSTON.

Faith and Freedom.

By STOPFORD A. BROOKE. Edited, with Introduction, by EDWIN D. MEAD. Cloth, 12mo, 366 pages. Price, \$1.50.

This volume of sermons by the great English liberal preacher, selected chiefly from his later works, has been prepared for the special purpose of illustrating his theology and the general character of his religious thought, which have become matters of such peculiar interest by reason of his separation from the Church of England. An Appendix contains the much discussed letter to the congregation of Bedford Chapel, in which Mr. Brooke announced his withdrawal from the Church of England, and the sermon, "Salt without Savor," in which he more fully stated his reasons for the step. The volume forms altogether the completest possible index to the nature and development of Mr. Brooke's thought, and is calculated to render an invaluable service at the present time, when men everywhere are so eager and anxious for clear and solvent words upon the questions of religion.

For sale by all booksellers. Sent, postpaid, on receipt of price, by the Publisher,

GEO. H. ELLIS, 141 FRANKLIN STREET, BOSTON.



Old South Leaflets.

Messrs. D. C. HEATH & CO. take pleasure in announcing that, by special arrangement with the Directors of the Old South Studies in History and Politics, they have become the publishers for schools and the trade of the new general series of Old South Leaflets. The Old South Leaflets, which have been published, during the last five years, in connection with the annual courses of historical lectures at the Old South Meeting House in Boston, have attracted so much attention and proved of so much service, that the Directors have determined upon the publication of this general series, with the needs of schools, colleges, private clubs and classes especially in mind. The Leaflets are prepared by Mr. Edwin D. Mead. They are largely reproductions of important original papers, accompanied by useful historical and bibliographical notes. They will consist, on an average, of sixteen pages, and will be sold at the low price of five cents a copy or three dollars per hundred. The aim is to bring them within easy reach of everybody. The Old South work is a work for the education of the people, and especially the education of our young people, in American history and politics, and its promoters believe that few things can contribute better to this end than the wide circulation of such Leaflets as those now proposed. It is hoped that professors in our colleges and teachers everywhere will welcome them for use in their classes, and that they may meet the needs of the societies of young men and women now happily being organized in so many places for historical and political studies. Some idea of the character of this series may be gained from the following list of the subjects of the first nineteen numbers, which are now ready.

No. 1. The Constitution of the United States. 2. The Articles of Confederation. 3. The Declaration of Independence. 4. Washington's Farewell Address. 5. Magna Charta. 6. Vane's "Healing Question." 7. Charter of Massachusetts Bay, 1629. 8. Fundamental Orders of Connecticut, 1638. 9. Franklin's Plan of Union, 1754. 10. Washington's Inaugurals. 11. Lincoln's Inaugurals and Emancipation Proclamation. 12. The Federalist, Nos. 1 and 2. 13. The Ordinance of 1787. 14. The Constitution of Ohio.* 15. Washington's Circular Letter to the Governors of the States, 1783. 16. Washington's Letter to Benjamin Harrison, 1784. 17. Verrazzano's Voyage, 1524. 18. The Constitution of Switzerland.* 19. The Bill of Rights, 1689, etc. Price, five cents per copy; one hundred copies, three dollars. *Directors of Old South Studies, Old South Meeting House, Boston.*

* Double number, price ten cents.

D. C. HEATH & CO., 5 Somerset St., Boston.

377.82 M46r

CLAPP



3 5002 00040 5923

Mead, Edwin D.

The Roman Catholic Church and the public

LB 1569 .M433 1890

Mead, Edwin D. 1849-1937.

The Roman Catholic Church
and the public schools

